
THE CRITICAL REVIEW.

For the Month of *September*, 1756.

ARTICLE I.

A Treatise on the three medicinal MINERAL WATERS at Llandrindod, in Radnorshire, South Wales. With some remarks on mineral and fossil mixtures, in their native veins and beds; at least as far as respects their influence on water. By Diederick Wessel Linden, M. D. 8vo. Pr. 5. Owen.

THIS performance is published by subscription in a small octavo volume, digested into books, and subdivided into chapters; and the author, in his preface, without denying that he partly was induced by motives of interest to favour the world with this production, gives us to understand that he was chiefly influenced by the desire of being beneficial to his fellow-creatures, and the suggestions of gratitude, he himself having been surprisngly cured of an inveterate scorbutic ulcer, by using the waters of *Llandrindod*.

From the former works of this teutonic physician, as well as from the performance now before us, we may venture to affirm, that he not only has been conversant with the most intricate processes of what is now called chymistry; but is also an adept in the more abstruse science of alchymy, as he talks of the mercury in the vegetable and animal kingdoms, and concludes that the *gas sylvestre* of *Helmont*, or vapour produced in fermentation, is no other than that *mercurius metal-lorum*. Besides, he possesses another quality of a true alchy-

VOL. II.

H

mist,

mist, namely, that of being sometimes so dark and mysterious, that none but adepts can understand his meaning.]

His introduction contains a topographical description of *Llandrindod*, with an account of the soil and atmosphere; which last, he says, is as pure as that of *Montpelier*, and from the fine, wholesome, well fermented malt liquor brewed upon the spot, concludes, that every thing thereabout is endowed with salutary properties. Then he supposes that coal is contained in the mineral zonic of *Llandrindod*, proceeds to mention the manner in which the waters were brought in repute, and concludes with a panegyric upon Mr. *William Grosvenor*; the publican of the place, whose malt liquor the doctor seems to have some particular reason for extolling.

In the first book we meet with a detail of common experiments on the rock water of *Llandrindod*, from whence he concludes that it participates of iron, salt, sulphur, and vitriol, and may be termed *Salino-sulphureo-chalybeat*—no offence to the learned Dr. *Lucas*. Our chymist, after having given his reasons for supposing that there is a borax in the salt of this water, and described from *Hoffman* the ætherial, elastic, volatile spirit with which the water is impregnated, proceeds to insert a letter, in which there is a curious account of the *Chevron* or *Bru* waters, about five miles from the *Pouhon Spa* in *Germany*.

“ My Lord,

“ *London, October 14.*

“ In obedience to your lordship’s commands, I shall now give
 “ some account of the *Chevron* and *Bru* waters; or attempt
 “ to prove, by experiments, their pernicious qualities. It is
 “ really surprising, that any persons, of the least understanding,
 “ should be prepossessed in favour of this liquid poison.
 “ For, from what I have been able to gather, the brisk sparkling
 “ of the water alone has led them to conclude, that it
 “ must be endued with sanative virtues. But I shall endeavour
 “ to convince your lordship, in the course of this letter, that
 “ the sparkling quality, for which it is so much esteemed,
 “ ought, on the contrary, to deter the human species from
 “ the use of it; as it does brute animals.

“ The

“ The college of physicians at *Liege*, in the year 1711,
“ made a public declaration against the use of *Chevron* or *Bru*
“ waters ; in which they observed, among other particulars,
“ *That these waters receive a deeper tincture, with galls, than*
“ *those of the Pouhon Spa, by reason of a sharp vitriolous and*
“ *fixed salt, wherewith they are impregnated.* They proceed
“ with a deal of hypothetical closet-jargon, which, upon the
“ whole, amounts to no more than this ; That the *Bru* wa-
“ ters have done much mischief, and that the many melan-
“ choly consequences ensuing therefrom, had obliged them
“ to protest against their use. This, your lordship will easily
“ perceive, is no more than what any common empiric, quite
“ ignorant of nature, might have said ; as he could readily
“ observe, that the votaries to these waters were quickly car-
“ ried to the other world ; but what these pernicious qualities
“ are, which produced these fatal effects, they have not at-
“ tempted to demonstrate. However, this shall not be the
“ present case ; for I will not only impeach the *Bru* water,
“ but also prove, by indisputable experiments, what are its
“ poisonous contents.

“ This *Bru* water (from which I have extracted the æthe-
“ rial mineral spirits) actually contains a perfect arsenic ; and
“ the arsenical particles are principally lodged in the sparkles
“ that so plentifully appear in the water ; consequently, if a
“ large quantity of it is taken, it will act, in all respects, as
“ common arsenic, and destroy the patient ; hence it is, that
“ all who use it, die of the same consumption that is incident
“ to smelters and artificers in metals ; because, as most me-
“ tals contain arsenic, the bellon, or smelters consumption,
“ is peculiarly occasioned by it.

“ The iron contents in the *Bru* waters are, by the arsenic
“ in them, brought into spicular forms, like darts ; as may
“ clearly be observed through a magnifying glass, when pre-
“ cipitated out of the water ; so that when they meet with a
“ costive constitution, or a pressure of the excrements, they
“ tear the smaller vessels of the intrails ; and from hence it
“ is, that frequent inward bleedings are caused by *Bru* wa-
“ ters.

“ These, my Lord, are their hurtful qualities ; which indeed are such, as will induce any considerate person to detest them, if he has the least regard to the preservation of his health ; and that these accusations are wholly built upon facts, will fully appear to your Lordship from the following experiments.

“ *Exper. 1.* Take of Tunbridge, Islington, or any other volatile chalybeate water, a large bottle-full, at the spring-head ; and immediately after it is filled, fix a glass or iron tube upon the water in the neck of the bottle, and stop the space between the bottle and the tube close ; but let that part of the tube that is out of the bottle extend downwards, and be so formed, as to have a wide-spreading opening at the end, like the mouth of a funnel. Under this put two drams of arsenic, and two drams of brimstone, well mixed together ; then set them on fire, so that the smoak of this mixture may pass through the pipe, upon the water in the bottle ; which, by means of this arsenical smoak, will, in less than five minutes, become, in every respect, a perfect *Bru* water, and bear exportation.

“ *Exper. 2.* Precipitate the iron earth out of the chalybeate water that has been treated with arsenical smoak, as directed in the foregoing experiment ; and then it will appear, through a magnifying glass, all in *spiculæ*, like unto sharp-pointed darts.

“ *Exper. 3.* Precipitate the earth out of *Bru* water, and compare it with that obtained by the second experiment ; when it will be found equal, in every respect, without any manner of difference whatever.

“ *Exper. 4.* Precipitate the earth out of some of the water of the same spring from whence that of the first experiment was taken, and also the earth out of some of the *Pouhon* water, and examine and compare them with that of the first experiment, and that obtained from the *Bru* water ; and they will not be found alike, in any shape ; but the two first will appear in small atoms, that cannot possibly do any hurt whatever.

“ These sharp-pointed darts proceed intirely from arsenic ; which, when mixed with metalline or mineral contents,
“ will

will always form into spangles. This occasioned the false judgment in *Lemery*, *Geofroy*, and several other *French* chemists; who imagined, that all poisonous qualities existed in spicular forms: but that is far from truth; because experience has convinced us, that whenever arsenic meets with the intrails and juices of animals, without any other mineral contents, it will perfectly dissolve them. Hence it is necessary, in a person who has been poisoned with arsenic, that the cadaver should be examined before the third or fourth day; else the arsenic-contents cannot be discovered. But it must be confessed, when arsenic is mixt with other mineral contents, it is doubly armed with destroying weapons. Therefore, if your Lordship, for the future, should chuse to make use of any foreign spa-waters, I most humbly advise it may be of the *Pouhon*.

“I am yours, &c.

“*Diederick Wessel Linden.*”

What says the elaborate *Lucas* to this investigation? ‘There is no doubt, says Dr. *Linden*, of the real existence of sulphur in mineral waters; because the whole mineral region is replete therewith. In the course of our experiments we have not made it apparent to the senses; except in the thirty-sixth, where we have made it as conspicuous, as if it was rendered corporeal, or produced in substance: nay, really and corporally it is there; because arsenic is the only magnet for sulphur. Yellow arsenic, whether natural or artificial, cannot exist without a perfect sulphur; that is, ’tis sulphur which constitutes the very essence of the yellow colour: and you may as certainly conclude, from that experiment, that the medicinal rock-water at *Llandrindod* contains sulphur, as if it was extracted *per se*.

‘As to its specific gravity, I have spoken in the 37th experiment; wherein I have assured you, that, tho’ variable, yet it is, at all times, suitable and agreeable to the human constitution.

‘From what has been said, we may safely conclude, that the rock-water of *Llandrindod* contains;

‘ 1. A very great plenty of æthereal, elastic, volatile mineral spirits.

‘ 2. A mineral balsam of the amber kind; which is combined with the before-mentioned volatile spirits, and the iron mucilage.

‘ 3. A volatile vitriolic acid.

‘ 4. A large and sufficient quantity of ferruginous contents.

‘ 4. A perfect sulphur.

‘ 6. A neutral purging salt, participating of the nature of borax.

‘ 7. The common vehicle water.

‘ So that this water is a perfect purgative chalybeate, excellently well impregnated with other salutary mixtures, so as to become one of the most sovereign remedies, and safe even in the most enfeebled constitution.’

He says the contents of this water proceed from pyrites, an iron earth, a vitriolic acid, a sulphur, an absorbent earth, and the carbonous fossil or pit coal. He supports his assertions with judicious observations and experiments, and boldly affirms (p. 51) that a saline chalybeate water is in no corner of the world to be met with, nay, cannot possibly exist, unless the rarified damps, at least within two miles distance from a bed of coal, come in subterraneous passages, and intervene with the generative matters that constitute such a water.

From his analyzation of this water, and experience, he concludes that it is efficacious in diseases of the lax fibre, scorbutic eruptions, weak nerves, asthma, palsy, epilepsy, agues, obstructions of the viscera, feminal weakness, and distempers peculiar to the fair sex. He next launches out into a more minute detail and theory of those maladies, which is but superficial, and in many places perplexed, and concludes the chapter with some proper cautions. ‘ In diseases that depend not upon a debilitated frame, I should be unwilling to recommend this water. Where there is a tense fibre; dense, rich blood; or in constitutions, that are otherwise distinguished with the epithets hot, adust, or bilious; it will certainly prove prejudicial. For as by stretching the string of a fiddle too much, you will probably break it; so, from
‘ over-

‘ over-bracing the fibres of the human body, dangerous consequences will ensue.

‘ The same caution is necessary with regard to age: for it is not a fit medicine at all times, and stages of life. Let us but consider that the longer we live, the fewer blood-vessels we retain in our bodies; and that the fibres become stiff, and lose in their spring or force, so as to be unable, from their too great rigidity, to give sufficient motion to the juices. This stiffness would be increased by the cohesive contracting power of the chalybeate contents. We may therefore conclude (allowances being made for the difference of temperaments) that this water is utterly to be avoided after 50 or 60 years of age.

The following chapter contains directions for the medical use of the rock water at *Llandrindod*, including necessary preparations for a course of drinking; the manner in which the course ought to be begun; the method of treating any accidental disorder that may happen during the course; the necessary management after the course is compleated; and the regulations to be observed with regard to after-effects or possible consequences. These directions are in general just and judicious, (tho’ some of them appear trivial) and may be of use to those valetudinarians who resort to other springs than those of *Llandrindod*.

The second book treats of the pump water, which, from a series of experiments, he believes, may contain a *sal enixum boracis nativi*, perfectly neutral, a small quantity of opaque bituminous parts, which, tho’ not dissoluble in water, will easily flux in the fire, æthereal, elastic, volatile, mineral spirits of the nature, of ambergris and mineral oil.

‘ Of what nature and quality, says he, the volatile, æthereal, elastic mineral spirits are in this water, we are informed by experiments the 2d and 3d. And we are indebted for this ambergris bitumen to the sulphur-water, which is contiguous to the saline purging-water. Both have a great affinity to each other; and are seldom or never found without each other. And by experience it is evident, that wherever we dig below, or through the saline spring, that then the first water or spring, that sets in below the salt spring, is most commonly

‘ a sulphureous one, from whence some matter, continually
 ‘ exhaling, the saline water gathers, and collects it; and
 ‘ thus obtains its æthereal, volatile, elastic, mineral spirit:
 ‘ nor need we wonder, that they change their nature by the
 ‘ admixtures with a saline body: for ambergris itself, when its
 ‘ salts are extracted from it, emits no more the pleasing, but
 ‘ the most disagreeable sulphureous smell: so that it is entirely
 ‘ owing to salts, that the scent or smell is so fragrant in this
 ‘ fossil. That ambergris is a fossil or mere pitch, is no longer
 ‘ doubted; since the great *Newman* proved it to the royal so-
 ‘ ciety in *London*.

In the second chapter of the second book, he examines the nature, existence, and original cause of the saline pump-water at *Llandrindod*. He taxes *Hoffman* with having contradicted, in page 82 of his observations on mineral waters, what he had advanced in page 51; but, in our opinion, Dr. *Linden* accuses him unjustly. *Hoffman*, in page 51, says there are many medicinal springs that contain a certain salt, which has hitherto no proper name assign'd it, and is of a neutral nature betwixt acid and alkali. And in page 82 he observes there are medicinal springs which can neither be reckoned among the *acidulæ*, *thermæ*, nor steel waters; but are of their own peculiar nature, and contain a pure neutral bitter purging salt. Now we should be glad to know in what the contradiction consists: to us, the second passage, far from contradicting, seems to corroborate the first. Indeed, this is one place in which Dr. *Linden* does not appear to understand himself; for he plunges into a strange subterraneous fermentation of fossils, the gas of which seems to have had an effect upon his intellects. He affirms (page 170) that every mineral has its peculiar salt; and in the very next sentence owns that limestone, spar, asbestos, talc, slate, chalk, &c. with the help of sulphureous damps and acids, constitute a common esculent salt. In short, the investigation of salt is a subject that seems to have puzzled and perplexed all our modern chymists. Mondic or pyrites (says our author, page 171) with seawater will break out into a perfect flame; and if some bituminous matter is mixed therewith, the fiery eruption is greatly facilitated, or sooner excited; and becomes more perfect:

‘perfect: mondic is also promiscuously found amongst coal.
 ‘The masters of coal-vessels should therefore be prodigiously
 ‘careful to prevent the sea-water from coming to the coal
 ‘they carry; else they may chance to fall a sacrifice to the
 ‘sea by the means of the fire.’

The following remark may be of service: ‘Whenever there is brine, or water that will make common salt, there is certainly coal through all that zonic. Hence it comes that coal is always found near the sea shore; (and often at a great distance from the sea shore, as on *Black-beath*, *Hounslow-beath*, and in inland parts of *Northumberland* and *Scotland*) for it is impossible for coal to generate or exist without the help of brine. In *Germany* we have this thing exemplified; for we have coal no where, but in such places where the brine water is seen: and again, never is this briny water without coal. *Credat judæus apella*. In page 180 he takes occasion to condemn the use of sea-water, to this effect: ‘Since we have mentioned the sea-water, the panacea, or fashionable medicine of this present age, we cannot pass over it without giving our opinion; and informing our readers, that on analyzing sea-water, there appears so many crudities, that we conceive it highly detrimental to the human body; and fear the use of it will, in process of time, manifest its pernicious consequences. That there are these crudities, the salt-boilers can testify; and in such abundance, that they are obliged, in this coarse mechanical operation, to use eggs, or ox-blood for a precipitate.’ Notwithstanding this stricture, we must take leave to affirm, that experience contradicts the doctor’s hypothesis; and that expert salt-boilers never use eggs or blood for a precipitate.

He recommends the pump-water of *Llandrindod* as an excellent remedy in the scurvy and tetters eruptions, the hypochondriac malady, obstructions in the viscera, the morpew, slow nervous fevers, the leprosy and gravel. After a short theory of these diseases, he directs the patient with regard to the preparatory evacuations, the method to be pursued in the course, the regimen and diet, the removal of symptoms that may appear during the course, the management after the course, the effects that remain after the use of the water, the sort

sort of valetudinarians that ought to bathe in this saline water, the method of guarding against the bad consequences attending baths, and rules to be observed after bathing. These directions are minutely circumstantial, and well adapted to the purposes for which they are intended.

Book III begins with a physical and historical account of the sulphureous water at *Llandrindod*, commonly called *the black stinking water*. He observes this has the following characteristics of sulphureous water: it emits a smell like that of the washings of a foul gun; near the spring head it lines the sides of all the passage with a white slimy mucus; it stinks most in rainy weather; after a drought, just before rainy weather, the spring rises with greater impetuosity than at other times; it instantaneously stops fermentation; it precipitates a black sludge in its passage; it turns silver and other white metals, first yellow, then black; it kills vermin, worms, caterpillars, &c.

In page 246, he affirms that these stinking sulphur waters have their existence from the vapours of a mineral ferment, to which the coal damp and the brine alkali are joined; and that without these last no stinking sulphureous waters can naturally be expected. In the rock from whence the spring issues, he conjectures that there is a confused mass of minerals in a constant ferment, with which the bituminous matter of brine and the briny alkaline earth mixes, and thus being join'd by the coal damp, constitutes the stinking or sulphur water of *Llandrindod*. 'In this supposed ferment, (says he, page 253) we may conclude the mondic, or sulphureous marcasites, to be one of the principal and chief agents; because there is very little in the bowels of the earth, but mondic or sulphureous marcasites, that can produce it.

'A pure sulphur also enters the composition of this water; which precipitates itself into the black sediment; and out of the white mucus, that lines the sides, a perfect sulphur may be separated.'

Lest the reader should boggle at this mineral ferment, he thus explains himself in page 256; 'We have often here made mention of a mineral ferment; which word, however, we do not make use of in the strict sense, that fermentation

' is

‘ is generally understood in. I grant there are but three kinds
 ‘ of fermentation, the spirituous, acidulous, and putrid. But
 ‘ what I here mean by the term ferment, is an intestine com-
 ‘ motion of several minerals, caused by a dissimilitude of their
 ‘ component parts. From this intestine motion the unctuous
 ‘ matter, we are here speaking of, results: which, as it so
 ‘ much resembles fermentation, we have ventur’d to apply to
 ‘ it the name of ferment; and hope we shall not be censured
 ‘ for the application.

‘ This inward motion will exist amongst these several mine-
 ‘ rals, even when they are separated from their roots, or dug
 ‘ out of their matrix. For example, in many mineral coun-
 ‘ tries the marcasites, of all kinds, being promiscuously thrown
 ‘ in one heap together (tho’ above ground) such an inward
 ‘ motion will be excited, that sometimes it will break out in-
 ‘ to a flame: by which means, an alum, and vitriol is pro-
 ‘ duced; which being all extracted, and the remaining rub-
 ‘ bish thrown into a heap again, a new motion or ferment
 ‘ arises; which, as before, produces alum and vitriol; and
 ‘ so *ad infinitum*.

‘ The coal damp, which we have mentioned, as one of
 ‘ the causes of this sulphur-water, and to which we attribute
 ‘ the quality of destroying vermin, may perhaps convey a-
 ‘ larming ideas to our readers, and give them occasion to
 ‘ suspect it to be of a coarse rough nature; but we can as-
 ‘ sure them of the contrary.

‘ It is perfectly mild, and agreeable to the human consti-
 ‘ tution: for what is poison to one animal is a medicine to an-
 ‘ other. For example, a dog lives upon the same food as
 ‘ the human species; yet as much *crocus metallorum* as will
 ‘ poison ten men, will perfectly agree with a dog: and a-
 ‘ gain, one man may safely take as much *nux vomica*, as will
 ‘ kill several dogs.]

‘ As to the coal damp; they are no more than sulphureous.
 ‘ They are destitute of arsenical, or other noxious contents;
 ‘ with which other minerals are so much loaded: so that they
 ‘ are by no means detrimental to health; as experience con-
 ‘ firms. For smiths, and other artificers, that are constantly
 ‘ in the furnes of coal, have an uncommon share of health.

‘ And

‘ And where is there, in all the world, a more healthy place,
 ‘ than that opulent, but smoaky metropolis *London*; where,
 ‘ notwithstanding the uncommon multitude of people, but
 ‘ few physicians have practice enough to support themselves in
 ‘ any tolerable dignity.

‘ Before I conclude this chapter, I cannot help observing,
 ‘ that I look upon this sulphur more beneficial, and far pre-
 ‘ ferable, to cleanse and purify a ship, and its crew, that
 ‘ come from places infected with the plague, than the fumi-
 ‘ gation with brimstone (of which lately an ingenious method
 ‘ is published by *Dr. Hales*) and at the same time the operation
 ‘ would be more easily and conveniently performed, than by
 ‘ the troublesome method, that is laid down, with fumiga-
 ‘ tion.’

‘ From the experiments recapitulated in the second chap-
 ‘ ter, our author concludes that this foetid or stinking water
 ‘ contains æthereal volatile mineral spirits, a small quantity of
 ‘ vitriolic acid, a mineral unctuous mucus, a fine mineral oil,
 ‘ a subtle crocus of marcasites soluble in spirit of wine, a per-
 ‘ fect sulphur, and a neutral salt, whose texture is a briny al-
 ‘ kali. From these considerations, he recommends it in the way of
 ‘ a warm bath, for benumbed, wasted, or contracted limbs; in
 ‘ the hypochondriac distemper; in the reliicks of venereal dis-
 ‘ orders, old sores, tetters, leprosy, and scurvy; in the hydro-
 ‘ phobia and madness; in the stone and gravel; in the gout
 ‘ and rheumatism. / The internal and external use of it com-
 ‘ bined, will cure the scrophula, hypochondriacy; edulcorate
 ‘ the acrimonious humours; restore the functions of the sto-
 ‘ mach and other viscera, when clogged or debilitated; cleanse
 ‘ the primæ viæ; remove obstructions of the liver; dissolve
 ‘ schirrous tumours; stop the dysentery; despel the cause of the
 ‘ lyentery; banish an habitual tenesmus if injected as a clyster;
 ‘ put a stop to the vertigo; attenuate, divide, and evacuate the
 ‘ humours of the catarrh; and, above all other remedies, check
 ‘ the progress of the consumption; it is moreover beneficial in
 ‘ nervous convulsions, and hysteric colics.

The last chapter contains directions for drinking, bathing,
 and all other medical uses of the sulphur-water at *Llandrindod*.
 These instruct us how to make an artificial bath, and how to
 guard

guard against all consequences which sometimes ensue upon bathing; how to use a bath made with this water; how to foment with this water; how to cleanse and wash old sores with this water; how to dress them with the black slimy precipitate; and how this water may be drank in conjunction with bathing; and how it must be taken when bathing is omitted.

What follows is a postscript describing the benefit that might be received by persons afflicted with intermitting fevers, from the use of the saline pump-water of Llandrindod, or its salts when exported.

The appendix, containing a short and summary account of several other springs of the mineral waters in Wales, &c. seems to be a meagre expedient to fill up the volume, which is eked out with many needless digressions, quotations and repetitions.

If we may credit the experiments and remarks of this high-german doctor, there is hardly a distemper incident to the human frame, that may not be effectually cured by the medicinal waters of Llandrindod: those general and sanguine encomiums favour so strongly of empiricism, that while we recommend this work to the perusal of our readers, we think it our duty to propose that they should peruse it with caution.

ART. II. *A free and candid Examination of the Principles advanced in the Rt. Rev. the Lord Bishop of London's very elegant Sermons lately published; and in his very ingenious Discourses on Prophecy. Wherein the commonly received System, concerning the Natures of the Jewish and Christian Dispensations, is particularly considered: with occasional Observations on some late Explanations of the Doctrines therein contained. By the Author of The Critical Enquiry into the Opinions and Practice of the Ancient Philosophers, &c. 8vo. Pr. 5. Davis and Reymers.*

IT must give a sensible satisfaction to the few friends of piety and learning, yet remaining amongst us, to find that amidst all the difficulties, disappointments and discouragements, to which men of genius and abilities are every day more and more subjected, there are still some left who want not the allurements

lurement of temporal advantages to animate them in their search after truth, or to inspirit their zeal in the cause of religion and virtue: such as have courage enough to withstand the force of prejudice, and oppose the formidable strength of authority: who, without a servile submission to great names or distinguish'd characters, dare to defend the word of God against misrepresentation, and conscientiously refuse that deference to *human* wisdom which is only due to the *divine*. Such we may venture to pronounce is the conceal'd author of the excellent and spirited performance before us, where our readers will meet with great force of reasoning join'd with uncommon candour and ingenuity, a style lively and vigorous, and a manner throughout the whole which cannot fail to engage his attention, and to secure his applause.

The preface, which is masterly, begins thus:

‘ Reason (says our author) in religious matters stands but an ill chance of being heard, when one part of the public attention is engaged in the gratifications of *sense*; another busied in the visionary pursuits of an *over-heated fancy*; and the rest is securely reposing in the cool and venerable shade of authority.

‘ In the tumultuous scenes of life the voice of reason is too weak to be heard, or too difficult to be understood: In the indulgent anarchy of fancy, her language is too simple or too severe to persuade; but where authority bears sway, she is enjoined compliance, or reduced to silence.

‘ Thus we see, in one quarter she is stared at as a stranger; in another, she alarms as an enemy; and in the third, she is treated as a slave. Here indeed, her case is at the worst. She may familiarize herself to the sensual man; she may be reconciled to the visionary; but, with authority, she can come to no composition; tho’ she be unable to withstand its power. And yet it is against this last foe to reason that the following sheets are chiefly directed.’

In pursuance of this resolution, our author sets out by endeavouring to shew, in opposition to the bishop of London, Dr. Sykes, Dr. Law, and others, that the commonly received System concerning the natures of the two dispensations, as far as respects a
future

future state, is inconsistent with the history of the old testament, and with the doctrine of the new.

To give our readers a more adequate idea of the subject-matter in dispute, it may not be amiss previously to acquaint them with the nature of the *common system* here mentioned, and the arguments us'd in favour of it, that they may be the better enabled to determine the force of our author's objections to it.

The common system espoused by the *bishop* and some other eminent writers, is, that the great and leading principles of the gospel were revealed by *Moses* and the prophets to the antient *Jewish* people; and that the doctrine of *life* and *immortality* was as much the foundation and support of the one as of the other: in defence of which opinion it is urged, that, no dispensation of which the doctrine of a future state was not a part wou'd have been able to subsist in any age of the world; that, the antient revelations afforded a good proof of a future state; that Jesus did *not* give the first and only notice of this doctrine; that Christ did indeed *bring life and immortality to light*, but that the word *φωσις* means only an accession or increase of light, to afford a more exact view of objects which had been observed, though not distinctly; that Jesus therefore only cured some defects in that sight which was very good though not eagle-eyed before; that the figurative language of the old testament was intended for a veil or cover, which veil might notwithstanding be seen through; and that the Jews had frequent and *early* notice that the law was to cease and be repeal'd after the introduction of the new covenant; that the general belief of a future state appears from several passages in the Psalms and Prophets; and lastly, that what St. Paul says concerning the original publication of immortality by Christ, wou'd exclude the arguments for it drawn from the light of nature and reason.

In answer to these arguments (most of them drawn from the bishop of *London's* discourses) our author hath thought fit to produce the following, which we have with some care endeavour'd to collect and abbreviate for the entertainment of our readers.

This sensible writer, who seems to have been extremely conversant with the holy scriptures, observes, that the common system supposes the *Jews* better instructed in the principles of the

the *gospel* than is consistent with the account they give of themselves in the *old testament*, or which is given of them by the *apostles* in the *new*. That (as it is said in the latter) the great salvation of the *gospel* (i. e. eternal life) *first* began to be spoken by the Lord. But how cou'd Jesus be the *first* who taught it, if *Moses* and the *prophets* had taught it long before? That, life and immortality were brought to light by the *gospel* of Christ; that the word *φανέρω* must mean to render an object distinguishable, which was before unperceived; that the doctrine of a future state therefore must till then have been absolutely unknown; that the *Jews* are said to *sit in darkness* and *the shadow of death*; the *Jews* therefore cou'd never be said to *sit in darkness*, if according to the bishop's interpretation of this word, they had a good general view of the object. In regard to the types and figures intended for a veil or cover, he desires to know whether the *Jews* cou'd see through them or *not*? If, (says he) they *saw into* the spiritual sense, they cou'd have no doubts; if they did *not*, they cou'd have no proof. Let the patrons of the common system therefore tell us, whether the typical sense of the law was opened to, or concealed from, the *Jewish* church. If it was concealed, the doctrine of life and immortality must have been a secret, while this sense remained under a veil or cover. If it was opened, the temporary and preparatory nature of the law must have been opened too; and consequently its cessation, and the exemption of the gentiles from its rites and ceremonies, could not have been a *mystery*. We must therefore either suppose with the author of the *D. L.* that the doctrine of life and immortality *was a mystery*, or suppose that the calling of the gentiles *was no mystery*, in direct contradiction to St. Paul.

Our author farther observes, that the inspired writer wou'd not have said *the way to heaven was not made manifest*, (Heb. ii. 3.) if the *Jews* had been taught to expect eternal life. It is said also, that the law had a *shadow of good things to come*, and not the *very image* of the things; and consequently, that the author of the epistle to the *Hebrews* did not believe with the bishop of *London*, that the law afforded a *good proof* of a future state; for a *shadow* is a *good proof* of nothing, but of a substance kept out of sight, and of which they cou'd know only

only this, that it was *something*. St. Paul says moreover, that *Christ abolished* death by bringing life and immortality to light : if so, the empire of death must have arisen from the withholding the knowledge of a future state.

‘ Now if this was the circumstance (*says our author*) which
‘ *abolished* death, and yet, at the same time, we will hold that
‘ a *good proof of a future life* had been afforded by the law ; it will
‘ follow that death must have been, if not *totally*, yet *in a good*
‘ *measure*, abolished by *Moses*. And thus nothing considerable
‘ would have been reserved for *Jesus Christ*, who was only to
‘ give the last blow to an enemy already expiring, who had
‘ been deprived of his main power and strength by *another*
‘ hand.

‘ His lordship's principle therefore seems to present us with
‘ a very low and disparaging idea of our blessed saviour's at-
‘ chievements, the principal part of whose office had been
‘ discharged before he came : at best it is dividing the honour
‘ of the victory between *Moses* and *Jesus Christ* ?’

The passages in the psalms urg'd in favour of the common system are oppos'd by other passages implying the *disbelief* of it, (such are the 30th, 88th, and 115th) from whence our author concludes, that if *David* was acquainted with the doctrine contended for, he seems industrious to hide it in one psalm, and yet studious to publish and divulge it in another. Lastly, the learned prelate's assertion ‘ that the natural arguments in support
‘ of a future state are excluded by assigning the first publica-
‘ tion of immortality to *Jesus Christ*, is thus answer'd :

‘ The *natural* and *revealed* doctrines of a future state are
‘ very different. The best of men by the light of reason can
‘ expect only some slight and inconsiderable reward, of a *short*
‘ and *transient* duration ; as this might be a sufficient compen-
‘ sation for all their services and sufferings in the present life.
‘ On the other hand, revelation promises a recovery of our *lost*
‘ *inheritance*, or a state of *immortal* happiness and glory. And
‘ this is justly represented as the pure *gift* or *gratuitous favour*
‘ of God, since it flows intirely from his pleasure and good
‘ will, and is not to be deduced from any of the divine attri-
‘ butes by the light of nature and reason. Now as the natural
‘ and revealed doctrines were so very different, why might not

‘ the late publication of the one be very consistent with the
 ‘ early notice of the other ; or why might not the one be *ori-*
 ‘ *ginally* revealed by *Jesus*, notwithstanding the other had been
 ‘ previously discovered without his assistance ?’

In this chapter our author also attacks Dr. *Stebbing* and Dr. *Fortin* with some severity, and concludes with this very just observation, that ‘ it is not for beings of our narrow and limited
 ‘ capacities to reason *a priori*, or to dictate to God in what
 ‘ measure and proportion he *should* have revealed his will to the
 ‘ ancient *Jews*. If we would know what was *fit* to be done
 ‘ at this time, our only way is to sit down, and enquire what
 ‘ he actually *did* do. And if we will allow the writers of the
 ‘ New Testament to be competent judges of this matter, we
 ‘ must own, that the doctrine of life and immortality was *not*
 ‘ revealed at this time ; and therefore not *fit* to be revealed.’

Chap. II. Our author having endeavour’d to prove that the common system is confuted by the authority of the *new testament*, proceeds to shew that it will likewise disable us from defending the *old*, or satisfying the objections against the ancient prophecies : this leads him to a consideration of what the bishop of *London* has advanc’d concerning them. The bishop (*he observes*) has labour’d to prove, from the nature and reason of the thing, that types, wherever they are found, must needs have been first delivered with their proper explanation ; which, this writer remarks, is no better than inferring from the propriety and use of a veil or cover, that there was nothing to be veiled or covered. ‘ His lordship, (says he) assures us, that
 ‘ the ancient prophecies, *relative to the spiritual covenant*, were
 ‘ *given to establish and confirm the hopes of futurity*, or the doctrine of redemption and eternal life. But if they were given
 ‘ to explain, and to impress this doctrine on the minds of the
 ‘ people, why were they conveyed under types ? or why was
 ‘ the doctrine wrapped up in clouds and darkness, if it was to
 ‘ be established, dispensed, and propagated among the faithful
 ‘ of those times ? If it was to be thus propagated and dispensed,
 ‘ not only so *thick* a cover as that of types, but *any* cover whatever must have been unnecessary.’

Our author then takes to task the great polemic-writer Dr. *Stebbing*, who in this writer’s opinion has succeeded no better
 than

than his learned patron. The Dr. asserts, that types and secondary prophecies were intended for a veil or cover of the doctrines conveyed under them; one of which doctrines was a future state: according to *him*, it was the *whole substance* of the religion of those times, and yet this very doctrine was buried under the veil of types. 'Thus (*says our author*) the Law was given, and God interposed in a very *singular* and *extraordinary* manner, not to relume and restore the principal and important doctrines of religion, but to cover and hide them from his *favourite* and *chosen* people.'

He then returns to the bishop of *London*, and having separately consider'd his lordship's defence of three particular sorts of prophecy; I. Typical prophecies, and such as have a double meaning; II. Those which represent the gospel blessings under temporal and carnal images; III. Those which relate to the temporal affairs of the *jewish* people; he concludes with observing, that the bishop's description and account of these three sorts of prophecy will oblige him either to defend the *jewish* religion on Dr. *Warburton's* supposition that it had not the doctrine of a future state, or to give it up to the scorn of infidelity.

Our author having thus boldly and successfully led on his forces against the general, we shall not be surpriz'd to find him attacking the inferior officers, Dr. *Sykes* and Dr. *Middleton*, those well known writers against types and prophecies. As the nature of this work will not permit us to insert every particular objection which our author has made to these gentlemen, we shall only present our readers with his general charge against them, which, in our opinion, is in the subsequent pages extremely well supported.

'These learned persons (*says he*) both own that there is a strict connexion between the Old and New Testament, or, that the last was to be predicted and prefigured by the first. The question is, in what manner this prediction and prefiguration was to be made. The nature and reason of the thing tells us, it could not be *plainly* and *openly*, because this would have prejudiced the *Jews* against the law. The learned persons themselves tell us, it could not be *plainly* and *openly*, because the peculiar nature and genius of the *new* religion, was

‘ to remain a mystery, and to be kept secret, at the time of
 ‘ giving the prophecies. Now if it was to be predicted for
 ‘ the use of *future* times, and yet to be kept out of sight of
 ‘ the *present*, the *secondary* sense of prophecy must have been
 ‘ a proper mode of conveyance, as it was excellently well
 ‘ adapted for the performance of both these services at the
 ‘ same time.

‘ Now Dr. *Middleton* and Dr. *Sykes* both suppose, that the
 ‘ things to be prefigured were to be put under a *veil*, or *cover* ;
 ‘ and yet both deny the propriety of a *secondary* sense in pro-
 ‘ phesy. On the other hand, the lord bishop of *London*, and
 ‘ Dr. *Stebbing*, both assert the propriety of a *secondary* sense,
 ‘ and yet both take away the use of a *veil* or *cover*, as they sup-
 ‘ pose the *prediction* and *prefiguration* were intended for the use
 ‘ of the times in which they were delivered.

‘ The two first oppose the *secondary* sense on such principles,
 ‘ as necessarily tend to establish it : and the two other defend
 ‘ it on such principles, as necessarily tend to overthrow it. Dr.
 ‘ *Middleton* and Dr. *Sykes* hold, that there was something to
 ‘ be veiled and covered ; yet deny there was any *veil* or *cover* :
 ‘ My lord bishop and Dr. *Stebbing* hold that there was a *veil*
 ‘ or *cover* ; yet deny there was any thing to be veiled or
 ‘ covered.’

Chap. III. In this chapter our author examines the bishop
 of *London*'s explanation and account of the book of *Job*,
 in which his lordship had maintained, ‘ I. That the argu-
 ‘ ment between *Job* and his friends turns upon this point, whe-
 ‘ ther the afflictions of this world are certain marks of God's dis-
 ‘ pleasure, and an indication of the wickedness of those who suffer ?

‘ 2. That the book is of very high antiquity, and was writ-
 ‘ ten long before the time of *Moses*.

‘ 3. That the celebrated passage (*I know that my Redeemer
 ‘ liveth, &c.*) in the sixth chapter, relates to the resurrection.’

Our author here remarks, that ‘ there seems to be no natu-
 ‘ ral connection between the three points here maintained. On
 ‘ the contrary, the first is a direct contradiction to the *third* ;
 ‘ and even to the *second*, upon the principles of the common
 ‘ system. And, so circumstanced, the *second* is plainly incon-
 ‘ sistent

‘sistent with the *third*, as well as the *first*. Consequently, we cannot admit the *third*, without rejecting the *first* and *second*.’

If the first were true the dispute wou’d be at an end, and the difficulty perfectly clear’d up by the third. The first point is also inconsistent with the second, because the common system holds a future state to have been a popular doctrine among the worshippers of the true Gods at all times and in all places. But *Job*’s friends were absolute strangers to any notion of a future retribution.

The second is likewise inconsistent with the third, because if this book was older than the law, we may be certain it did not contain any clear and distinct revelation of this doctrine, for why need it have been hid under types in the *pentateuch*, if it had been openly exposed in other inspired writings, then in the hands of the *jewish* people? Add to this, that there cou’d be no occasion for *Moses* and the prophets to throw a veil over a doctrine which was plainly revealed in the book of *Job*. The hopes of futurity, (says the bishop) were reserved to be revealed by him whose province it was to bring life and immortality to light through the gospel. But how (replies our author) was this reserved for *Jesus Christ*, if, as his lordship tells us, a plain prophetic description of this very article was given in the book of *Job*?

Chap. IV. Treats on the particular end and design of the *jewish* law. It is agreed on all hands, that the law was instituted to preserve the doctrines which had been the foundation of the patriarchal religion; the bishop of *London* contends that the principle of redemption and a future state was one of these. This our author denies, and undertakes to prove, that such a supposition ‘is inconsistent with the nature of the law, considered as a preparatory or introductory dispensation. 2. That there is nothing to countenance and support it in the Old Testament. 3. That it directly contradicts many texts of the New, and also several passages in his lordship’s sermons and discourses on prophecy.’

The arguments which our author brings in confirmation of this charge against his lordship, are for the most part very forcible and satisfactory, he concludes with observing, that his lordship is but little content with the opinion of those wri-

‘ters, who are content with what the law represents of itself;
 ‘namely, that it was given to preserve the knowledge of the
 ‘one true God amongst the *Israelites*, whilst it was lost every
 ‘where else. He rejects this, as too low and narrow a de-
 ‘sign; and maintains, that it was intended for higher purposes,
 ‘and given to administer the like hopes with the christian co-
 ‘venant. But instead of enobling the law by loading it with
 ‘these new honours, he has only intangled it with fresh diffi-
 ‘culties, and enabled prophane men to attack it with more
 ‘vigour and success; by shewing that the nature of the two
 ‘dispensations, the authority of the two Testaments, and my
 ‘lord bishop’s own concessions, are all directly inconsistent
 ‘with this honourable hypothesis.’

Chap. V. Contains an enquiry, how far the doctrine ad-
 vanced in my lord bishop’s *sixth* sermon affects the argument
 of the *divine legation*; how far it tends to establish the credit
 of *Moses* and the *Prophets*: and how far it is consistent with
 the other parts of his lordship’s theological system. As the
 bishop in this sermon supposes that nothing but a full proof of
 the resurrection cou’d at any time be sufficient to support reli-
 gion, and as no such knowledge of a resurrection was granted
 to the *patriarchal* and *jewish* Churches, our author begs leave
 to ask how this deficiency was supplied, or what particular dis-
 pensation of providence was made use of, to preserve religion,
 without affording any perfect assurance or full persuasion of a
 future life? Secondly, it appears evident to our author, that the
 bishop’s doctrine cannot possibly tend to establish the credit of
Moses and the *Prophets*, because if (according to his lordship)
 the doctrine of the resurrection was the single point wanting,
 to compleat the *natural* argument for a future life, and the on-
 ly circumstance which made a revelation on this subject neces-
 sary; to suppose a revelation of a future state which said no-
 thing of this *resurrection*, wou’d be supposing a revelation
 which said nothing of the great point which ought principally
 to have been revealed.

‘Is it not therefore (*says he*) more for the credit of the
 ‘*jewish* revelation, to suppose, that it said nothing of a fu-
 ‘ture state, when it did not want it; than that it said nothing
 ‘to the purpose, when it did?’

Thirdly, his lordship's system is inconsistent with itself, because it asserts that the law afforded a *good proof* of a future life, and yet contends that life and immortality were brought to light by the gospel. If this passage, *I am the God of Abraham, &c.* extends, according to the bishop, to another life, that doctrine was the sanction of the *law* as well as the *gospel*, and of necessity, must have been as clearly revealed by *Moses* as by *Christ*; which wou'd flatly contradict the scriptures of the New Testament. It is inconsistent likewise, because it ascribes to the *law*, a *good proof* of a future life, and yet leaves the doctrine under doubts and uncertainties, by supposing it to have been convey'd by *types*, and figures: the bishop therefore seems to be taking with one hand and giving with the other. 'In a word (says our author) we magnify the *law* above the *gospel*, if we allow it to afford a *good proof of a future life*, as his lordship here supposes. For in this case, it would have the sanction both of the *life which now is*, and of *that which is to come*, while the gospel would have only the last.'

Though the bishop of *London* has asserted in one place, that the law afforded a good proof of a future state, he notwithstanding acknowledges in another, that the better hopes of a future life wou'd have *vacated* the *temporal* promises of the law. Thus, on different occasions, he makes no scruple to assert, both that the law *had*, and that it had *not* the doctrine of a future state; that is, he finds himself obliged to assert and deny the very same proposition in the very same sense. Our author having then treated at large this important question, 'whether the extraordinary providence, as recorded in the Old Testament, by a long series of miracles, can be supported against the objections of unbelievers, on the principles of the common system,' is naturally led to a few observations on Dr. *Warburton's Divine Legation*, which our readers may observe, it seems our author's chief aim to defend and support. He informs us notwithstanding (p. 355) that his design 'in these papers was not to consider the several objections, which have, or may be, alledged against the argument of the *D. L.* but only to shew the impossibility of defending revealed religion, on the supposition that the knowledge of a future state was always

‘ters, who are content with what the law represents of itself;
 ‘namely, that it was given to preserve the knowledge of the
 ‘one true God amongst the *Israelites*, whilst it was lost every
 ‘where else. He rejects this, as too low and narrow a de-
 ‘sign; and maintains, that it was intended for higher purposes,
 ‘and given to administer the like hopes with the christian co-
 ‘venant. But instead of enobling the law by loading it with
 ‘these new honours, he has only intangled it with fresh diffi-
 ‘culties, and enabled prophane men to attack it with more
 ‘vigour and success; by shewing that the nature of the two
 ‘dispensations, the authority of the two Testaments, and my
 ‘lord bishop’s own concessions, are all directly inconsistent
 ‘with this honourable hypothesis.’

Chap. V. Contains an enquiry, how far the doctrine ad-
 vanced in my lord bishop’s *sixth* sermon affects the argument
 of the *divine legation*; how far it tends to establish the credit
 of *Moses* and the *Prophets*: and how far it is consistent with
 the other parts of his lordship’s theological system. As the
 bishop in this sermon supposes that nothing but a full proof of
 the resurrection cou’d at any time be sufficient to support reli-
 gion, and as no such knowledge of a resurrection was granted
 to the *patriarchal* and *jewish* Churches, our author begs leave
 to ask how this deficiency was supplied, or what particular dis-
 pensation of providence was made use of, to preserve religion,
 without affording any perfect assurance or full persuasion of a
 future life? Secondly, it appears evident to our author, that the
 bishop’s doctrine cannot possibly tend to establish the credit of
Moses and the *Prophets*, because if (according to his lordship)
 the doctrine of the resurrection was the single point wanting,
 to compleat the *natural* argument for a future life, and the on-
 ly circumstance which made a revelation on this subject neces-
 sary; to suppose a revelation of a future state which said no-
 thing of this *resurrection*, wou’d be supposing a revelation
 which said nothing of the great point which ought principally
 to have been revealed.

‘Is it not therefore (*says he*) more for the credit of the
 ‘*jewish* revelation, to suppose, that it said nothing of a fu-
 ‘ture state, when it did not want it; than that it said nothing
 ‘to the purpose, when it did?’

Thirdly, his lordship's system is inconsistent with itself, because it asserts that the law afforded a *good proof* of a future life, and yet contends that life and immortality were brought to light by the gospel. If this passage, *I am the God of Abraham, &c.* extends, according to the bishop, to another life, that doctrine was the sanction of the *law* as well as the *gospel*, and of necessity, must have been as clearly revealed by *Moses* as by *Christ*; which would flatly contradict the scriptures of the New Testament. It is inconsistent likewise, because it ascribes to the *law*, a *good proof* of a future life, and yet leaves the doctrine under doubts and uncertainties, by supposing it to have been convey'd by *types*, and figures: the bishop therefore seems to be taking with one hand and giving with the other. 'In a word (says our author) we magnify the *law* above the *gospel*, if we allow it to afford a *good proof of a future life*, as his lordship here supposes. For in this case, it would have the sanction both of the *life which now is, and of that which is to come*, while the gospel would have only the last.'

Though the bishop of *London* has asserted in one place, that the law afforded a good proof of a future state, he notwithstanding acknowledges in another, that the better hopes of a future life would have *vacated* the *temporal* promises of the law. Thus, on different occasions, he makes no scruple to assert, both that the law *had*, and that it had *not* the doctrine of a future state; that is, he finds himself obliged to assert and deny the very same proposition in the very same sense. Our author having then treated at large this important question, 'whether the extraordinary providence, as recorded in the Old Testament, by a long series of miracles, can be supported against the objections of unbelievers, on the principles of the common system,' is naturally led to a few observations on Dr. *Warburton's Divine Legation*, which our readers may observe, it seems our author's chief aim to defend and support. He informs us notwithstanding (p. 355) that his design 'in these papers was not to consider the several objections, which have, or may be, alledged against the argument of the *D. L.* but only to shew the impossibility of defending revealed religion, on the supposition that the knowledge of a future state was always

‘ necessary and essential to the support of it.’ And concludes the book in the following words :

‘ Many more considerations may be deduced from the foregoing sheets, to shew the impossibility of defending revealed religion, on the supposition that a future state was always necessary and essential to the support of it. Whenever these objections are discharged to the satisfaction of the public, I shall readily acquiesce in his lordship’s system. All my view is, to get the question fairly and impartially examined ; and therefore I have often addressed myself to two ingenious and learned writers, who seem to be well qualified for this task. I have no objection to suppose a future state has always been necessary and essential to religion ; if so be they are able to prove that it was always as *plainly* and *explicitly* delivered, as the sanction of a revealed system ought to be. If they can produce no proof that it was thus plainly and explicitly revealed, it may be dangerous to assert its necessity ; as this would be pointing out to the Deists an easy and effectual way of impeaching the divinity and truth both of the patriarchal and Jewish Dispensations.

‘ To conclude, in the words of a very excellent person, “ If I have argued amiss, I shall surely hear of it. Every man of common sense is judge of these arguments ; and I only wish they may be impartially examined.”

Though our author’s attacks throughout the book are principally levell’d against the bishop of *London*, we meet also with some severe strictures on several other eminent writers, not only the laborious *Stebbing* and the candid *Leland* ; but the ingenious *Middleton* and the learned *Fortin* have fallen under his censure ; *Law*, *Rutherford*, *Brown*, *Peters*, and some others are likewise called upon to defend their tenets ; so that if the several challenges are accepted, we may expect warm work in the field of religious controversy the ensuing winter. Our hero, however, (if we may judge by the performance before us) seems possess’d of courage and talents sufficient to enter the list with any of them : he thinks clearly, and deliver his thoughts with perspicuity : there is besides a spirit and freedom in his manner, which, especially in the present dearth of good writers, cannot fail to distinguish him from the common herd, and to point him

him out as one of the most able as well as most zealous friends of the truly learned and ingenious author of the *Divine Legation*.

ART. III. *A serious defence of some late measures of the administration; particularly with regard to the introduction and establishment of foreign troops.* 8vo. Pr. 1s. Morgan.

IN an age like the present, so fond of being thought wise and witty, wherein every man had rather be call'd knave than fool, ridicule, if well pointed, is perhaps the best weapon we can make use of against the attacks of vice and folly, either in public or private life: the keen raillery and true humour of the little piece before us therefore will, we doubt not, be of infinitely more service at this juncture than the loud bawlings of a *Monitor*, or the rancorous invectives of a *Letter to the people of England*. The author of this pamphlet, arm'd with the shield of irony, takes upon him to defend, what so many have lately look'd upon as *indefensible*, the measures of our present administration, particularly with regard to the introduction of foreign troops; the reason and end of which salutary measure this ingenious writer has luckily discovered, which he doubts not, when known, will meet with universal applause, and endear the contrivers of it to their grateful country.

' It is well known, (*says our arch defender*) how great a clamour was raised, and still subsists, artfully propagated by the enemies of government, as if, by introducing *Hessians* and *Hanoverians* into this country, they who directed this measure had sacrificed the honour of *England*, endangered its liberties, and opened a wide door to all the evils which usually ensue when the governed feel that their governors have not the interest of their country at heart. But these are clamours which could never have existed, or gained ground, but amongst persons totally ignorant of the views and motives aimed at by the bringing over of *Germans*. What those reasons were which induced the wisdom of government to take this step, I shall now undertake to disclose, asserting that the present defence

' of

‘ of *Britain* from *French* invasions was not the sole object of
 ‘ those wise ministers who brought over foreign troops amongst
 ‘ us ; but that they had, besides this, a nobler object in view,
 ‘ viz. the future and lasting support of our island, by invigora-
 ‘ ting the withered trunk of *English* manhood by a seasonable
 ‘ infusion of *foreign* blood.’

He then observes, by way of analogy, that farmers vary their seed, virtuosi in fruits and vegetables improve their taste and flavor by transplanting foreign ones, and jockies import *Arabian* stallions to improve *British* horse-flesh ; which naturally suggested to our rulers the necessity of mending the degenerate breed of *Englishmen*, by crossing it with a judicious mixture of *foreign* blood. ‘ Under pretence therefore, (says he) ‘ of a foreign invasion, our wise politicians at the helm ‘ have been able to effectuate their glorious plan of restoring ‘ the decayed constitutions of *Britons*, by the importation of ‘ sixteen thousand vigorous *Germans*.’

We defy the most phlegmatic of our readers to pass over the following paragraph without a smile.

‘ That the great object of mending the breed was understood to be aimed at, by the introduction of foreign armies, ‘ tho’ it was not expressly taken notice of by an act of the ‘ legislature, may be inferred with the utmost certainty, from ‘ a resolution which was taken in parliament, immediately after the landing of the *Hessians* and *Hanoverians*—I mean ‘ the opening of the Foundling-hospital, for the reception of ‘ all infants brought to it ; towards the expence of which a ‘ sum of money was unanimously voted to be applied.

‘ Now it cannot but strike every considerate observer of ‘ times and seasons, that no good reason can be assigned why ‘ the introduction of foreign troops, and the opening of the ‘ foundling hospital by vote of parliament, should go hand in ‘ hand, unless the former was intended to be the means of ‘ increasing the number of candidates for the latter. To ‘ find the ministry, therefore, at this particular time, busied ‘ in procuring a fund for the *maintenance* of children, naturally ‘ leads us to suppose, that they had thought of a scheme for ‘ *begetting* them, by introducing amongst us so many thousands of able-bodied *Germans*.

Having

Having thus discovered the prudent intentions of the ministry, in furnishing the public with so many thousands of able *recruiters*, to enrich our impoverished blood, and raise up a race properly *germanized*, he proposes that the *recruiters* shou'd immediately repair to the several public wells or *spa's* of the kingdom, there to exercise their talents, and lay the foundation of heroes, who may shame the present generation; but 'as it sometimes happens, (says he) in public offices, that the business of them passes through the hands of persons, *who are new in their employments*; to prevent any mistake or *clashing* of orders, I would not have the war-office further concerned in this important matter, than to transmit to the adjutant-generals of the *Hessians* and *Hanoverians* the lists of females, at each respective place, who have occasion for assistance, that so an exact *roster* may be made out, and the detachments to be sent may be proportioned to the demand that there shall appear to be for them.' He then proposes that these *German* auxiliaries shou'd march up to the capital, where they will have constant opportunities of labouring in their vocation; and to make way for them, thinks it wou'd not be amiss to send 'not only our *British* guards, but also the rest of our *British* forces, to that part of the world, in order to be exchanged for a like number of electoral troops, to be added as a reinforcement to those whom we have already here. By which means the grand view of introducing foreigners will be answered in a more extensive manner, as instead of sixteen thousand, we may have double that number of *recruiters*. But I submit all this to the superior judgment of a council of war, composed of *British* commanders, by whom I would have this point debated, and whose determination (if we may judge from the determination of two late famous councils of war) will be so prudent, as to *preserve his majesty's troops from danger*.'

Our author's next scheme, to erect an hospital, has much humour in it. 'The erection and encouragement of hospitals (says he) seems to be a favourite taste amongst us, at present. As therefore, in the long catalogue of such charitable institutions in this *metropolis*, we have hospitals for the *reception of lying-in women*, and an hospital for the reception of children

‘dren when born, I have long wondered that some public-spirited gentlemen (for no doubt, our managers of hospitals are all public-spirited) have not thought of establishing hospitals for the begetting of children. This beneficial institution, which private charity hath no where encouraged, if the *child-getter* in *Newgate* is not to be excepted, will now be set on foot, upon the most extensive plan, by erecting seminaries of *Hessian* and *Hanoverian* heroes, in all the different quarters of *London*.

‘It is well known, that over the doors of our hospitals, we read their appellation with this addition, of their being supported by the voluntary subscriptions of noblemen, gentlemen, and others. Now, as this inscription may be looked upon as a sign judiciously hung out, to draw in a fresh supply of subscribers, I would have our *military hospitals* also hang out their signs; and in order to draw in a constant supply of fair visiters, upon the front of each of them there should be an inscription in large capitals, to the following effect: —*The German hospital for mending the breed, supported by the liberality of the British parliament.* Or if this should offend any delicate ears, it might be sufficient to represent, by a very natural *hieroglyphic*, the use and destination of our hospitals, by erecting before them the sign of the *white horse*, under which figure I would have written this word to the wife, *to cover for mending the breed.*’ He proposes likewise, for the encouragement of his fair country-women, ‘that the laws now in force, which take a severe notice of *ante-nuptial pregnancy* should be abolished, or, at least, lose their efficacy, in every case where it shall appear, that recourse was had to a *German* recruiter. Others again, might think it expedient that the lying-in hospitals should be opened by vote of parliament, in the same manner, as the foundling hospital hath been, to receive every candidate who should come loaded with a foreign burthen. A third encouragement may please a different set of females, *viz.* a suspension of the restrictive clauses of the *marriage act*, whenever *miss* in her teens shall give the preference to an husband chosen from our *military hospitals.*’

This

This public-spirited writer, who is as indefatigable as Mr. *Henriques* himself, in the service of his country, hath likewise thought of an excellent scheme to pay the national debt, which is as follows :

‘ That the ladies of *Great Britain* have a very considerable share of the property in the public funds, is a fact which can admit of no doubt. Now, I think, such proposals may be made to the female *stock-holders*, as will make it for their interest chearfully to transfer their properties to the public.

‘ Every one knows, that since the reduction of the interest of the funds, and the increase of luxury, our fair countrywomen of small fortunes, remain long, alas, very long ! at the market, and matrimony is a land, at which they have little hopes of arriving, though beheld with longing eyes. In this lamentable situation, how eagerly would they embrace any scheme for their relief ? Upon this principle, therefore, I would propose, that books should be opened at the treasury, and advertisements published, by authority, in the *London Gazette*, and all the news papers, making the following offer to all the female stock-holders ; That whoever should come in and subscribe her consent to sink the capital of her stock, and in its stead to accept of an annuity, at the same interest of 3*l.* per cent. which she now receives, should be encouraged by having an husband provided for her, to be chosen from the *military hospitals*, to be erected for mending the breed. This (says he) in a few years, will extinguish so much of our debts, as will enable us to pay the whole body of foreign troops, without laying on any new burthen, except upon the ladies.’

Our author’s interpretation of the *Hanoverian* motto on the grenadiers caps, is easy and natural ; the motto is,

Vestigia nulla RETRORSUM.

‘ A friend of mine (says he) who accompanied me, was so short-sighted as to understand, by this, nothing more than that *they would never turn their backs upon an enemy*. But the learned reader will agree with me, that this must be a mistake. For the words, literally interpreted, seem calculated to convey to us this most comfortable truth, that the

‘ *Hano-*

‘*Hanoverians will not turn their backs upon their friends in England; that is, that they will never quit this hospitable land, which hath called out to them for assistance, in time of danger, to return to the barren heaths, and bon-pour-nicol of Lower Saxony.*’

We have omitted many other excellent strokes in this little piece, that we might not totally anticipate our reader's pleasure in the perusal of it, and cannot conclude this article without recommending the concealed author's method to our present race of political writers, who seem utterly to have forgotten that there are such things in the world as *wit* and *humour*, which might be occasionally made use of to recommend their works to the age they live in, and (if they extend their hopes so far) perhaps secure them a favourable reception with posterity.

ART. IV. *Philosophical Transactions continued.*

THE forty-third article is part of a letter from Mr. *William Thornhill*, late surgeon to the infirmary at *Bristol*, who says he had used the agaric in four capital amputations, with extraordinary success.

The next essay contains an accurate description of an eclipse of the moon, written in latin by *John Mendez Sacchetti Barbosa*, communicated by *J. de Castro Sermento*, M. D. F. R. S.

What follows is a letter to *George Lewis Scot*, Esq; F. R. S. concerning the number of people in *England*, from the Rev. doctor *William Brakenridge*.—This learned calculator endeavours to discover the number of the people, from the number of houses and the quantity of bread consumed. He finds from the registers both in town and country, that there are four births to every marriage, at an average; it appears from Dr. *Halley's* table of the probability of life, that three of these children do not arrive at the age of maturity, and he thinks the number of a family, including servants and inmates, to be six persons, at a medium. At a public office he discovered that the number of houses in *England* and *Wales*, ascertained for some assessment, amounted, in the year 1710, to 729,048, exclusive of cottages that paid no tax; which he supposes might be one fourth of the number; and this, added to the former, will make 911,310: multiplying this again by six, the number in each

each family, we find the whole number of people, at that period, amounted to 5,467,860. Since the year 1710, he computes the increase at 789,558, which, added to the other, makes the number of people at present, in *England* and *Wales*, to be 6,257,418.

With respect to the other way of ascertaining the number, namely, that of considering the quantity of bread consumed, he endeavours to discover the quantity of wheat produced in *England*, by reasoning upon the proportion it bears to barley. He affirms that there is as much ground sown with barley as with wheat, and that the crop produced from barley, is to that produced from wheat as three to two. He finds from the bounty-money paid by the government, that 500000 quarters of wheat are annually exported. Some is used for mechanical purposes at home, besides that used for food; there is likewise some barley exported, and a great quantity used in fattening hogs. He supposes this consumption balances that of the wheat for exportation and mechanical uses. From the malt tax, in a series of years, he finds that 3,039,150 quarters of barley are consumed annually in malt; consequently, if the proportion of three to two holds between it and the wheat, there must be 2,026,100 quarters of wheat consumed at home yearly. One quarter of wheat produces 512 pounds of flour; each person, at an average, consumes seven ounces in a day; so that 2,026,100 quarters of wheat will sustain 6,078,300, or at least six millions of people. As some people in the northern counties use oat-meal and rye-meal, he allows for this circumstance, in his fixing no more than one quarter of wheat for three persons through the kingdom. Deducting 200,000 for those lost in our wars, since 1710, we find the two methods of calculation confirm each other; and, according to Dr. *Halley's* rule, there will be about fifteen hundred thousand men able to carry arms. So that Sir *William Petty* must be mistaken, who computed the number of people at 7,369,000, even in the year 1690.

Doctor *Brakenridge* endeavours to prove that *England* is thinly inhabited, and capable of maintaining nine millions of inhabitants. But, he is certainly mistaken in supposing that there is no more than one fifth waste ground: he is still more

more mistaken in allotting no more than one fourth of waste ground in *Ireland*; and errs egregiously in supposing that two thirds of *Scotland* are cultivated. We apprehend he would have come nearer the truth in computing one third of waste ground for *Ireland*, and one half for *Scotland*. * Yet we cannot but assent to his deduction, which is, that the *British* isles, duly cultivated, would sustain an addition of six millions to the present number of people that *England* now contains. Then he proceeds to shew that the quantity of land in the whole globe of earth would maintain above twenty-six times the present number of mankind; and that if we suppose births and burials, over all the globe, nearly in proportion to those of *England*, above one thousand years will elapse before the earth can be fully peopled. From this consideration too we are led to believe that the origin of mankind is not more ancient than it is commonly supposed to be.

By comparing the births with the burials, according to Dr. *Derham*, in his *Physico-theology*, and taking the mean between the two extreme degrees of health in *England*, which will fix the proportion of the dead to the living, as one to forty, that is 150,000 out of 6,000,000; the births being to the burials, as 1 to 1,12, will amount to 168,000, so that the annual increase must be 18,000. This is so much diminished by the emigrations of great numbers to our colonies and settlements, and by our wars and losses at sea, that were it not for the accession of foreigners and adventurers from *Scotland* and *Ireland*, the country might be depopulated.

Then the doctor proceeds to an algebraical calculation, by means of logarithms, in order to investigate the proportion of the increase; and he finds that, according to the present state of births and burials, the number of people would not be doubled in less than 231 years; that 230 years ago, in the reign of *Henry VIII*, the number could not be above one half of what it is at present; and that 135 years must elapse before *England* can be fully peopled. By the same general induction it appears, that if the number of people in *England*,
in

* The number of souls in *Scotland* is easily ascertained; for every minister keeps an exact register of all the men, women, and children, in his parish, that he may know who are fit and who are not fit to be catechised yearly.

in the year 1710, was 5,467,860, it would now amount to 6,250,000, if the increase has not been diminished by wars and emigrations.

Dr. *Brakenridge* has expended great pains and ingenuity in discovering, by abstracted mathematical calculation, the number of people in *England*, which might be easily ascertained, if the legislature would appoint certain persons in every parish of *Great Britain*, to number the people within their several districts in one day, and as nearly as possible in the same hours of that day. Every individual might be mentioned by name, in the place where he or she should happen to be at the time of enquiry, that there might be no risque of numbering the same persons twice, from their moving about during the investigation.

In the 46th article that indefatigable searcher into antiquity, Dr. *Ward*, presents us with an essay on two *Roman* inscriptions, found upon as many altars dug up at *Bath*. Much erudition hath he manifested in proving that the *Treveri* inhabited that part of *Belgic Gaul*, now called the electorate of *Triers*; that *Jupiter* in the inscription might be termed *Cetius*, from a mountain in *Germany* of that name; and that the word *Nemetona* may, for aught he knows, be the appellation of some goddess, tho', in order to make it grammar, it ought to have been *Nemetonæ*. He gives us to understand that the other altar is dedicated to certain deities called *Sulevæ*, and sometimes *Campestres*, in number three, like the Gorgons, Graces, Syrens, Sybils, &c. This altar is dedicated by *Sulinis Scultor*; but whether *Scultor* was the cognomen, or cut instead of *sculptor*, alluding to the workman, is a doubt which we apprehend, the doctor has not quite resolved. Those old stones are very apt to hurt the teeth of antiquarians before they can come at the kernel, which is seldom worth the trouble of cracking the case. Even these two inscriptions, notwithstanding the doctor's explanation, may exercise the ingenuity of other conjecturers, and at last prove hard crusts for the gums of the critick.

What follows is the description of an echinus, by *Gustavus Brander*, exhibited on a plate: and this is succeeded by an

account of the impression on a stone, dug up in the island of *Antigua*, in a letter from the rev. Mr. *Byam*, who sends likewise a table containing the quantities of rain which fell in that island for four years. The stone in which they found the impression, was brought from a quarry about three hundred yards higher than the high-water mark, and two miles from the sea: it exhibits the exact resemblance of a fish called the Old Wife, and is engraved from an elegant drawing of Mr. *Arthur Pond*, F. R. S. who, in the subsequent article, gives a more minute account of this strange phænomenon. It appears that the matter must have petrified around a real fish.

Gustavus Brander, Esq; makes his appearance again in a flash of lightening, which damaged the iron-work belonging to the clock of the *Danish* church in *Wellclose-square*.

The 51st article contains electrical experiments made by Mr. *Benjamin Franklin*, at *Philadelphia*, founded on these principles, that ‘electric atmospheres, which flow round non-
‘electric bodies, being brought near each other, do not readily
‘mix and unite into one atmosphere, but remain separate,
‘and repel each other.

‘This is plainly seen in suspended cork balls, and other bodies electrified.

‘An electric atmosphere not only repels another electric atmosphere, but will also repel the electric matter contained
‘in the substance of a body approaching it; and, without
‘joining or mixing with it, force it to other parts of the body,
‘that contained it.

‘This is shewn by some of the following experiments.

‘Bodies electrified negatively, or deprived of their natural quantity of electricity, repel each other, (or at least appear
‘to do so, by a mutual receding) as well as those electrified
‘positively, or which have electric atmospheres.

‘This is shewn by applying the negatively charged wire of
‘a phial to two cork balls, suspended by silk threads, and
‘by many other experiments.

These experiments are followed by the extract of a letter on the same subject, from the same gentleman, who, (in order

to prove that pointed rods of iron erected on buildings, and communicating with the moist earth, would either prevent a stroke of lightening, or conduct it so as the building should suffer no damage) relates the following accident: ' Being in the town of *Newbury* in *New-England*, in *November* last, ' I was shewn the effect of lightning on their church, which ' had been struck a few months before. The steeple was a ' square tower of wood, reaching seventy feet up from the ' ground to the place where the bell hung; over which rose ' a taper spire, of wood likewise, reaching seventy feet higher ' to the vane or weather-cock. Near the bell was fixed an ' iron hammer to strike the hours; and from the tail of the ' hammer a wire went down through a small gimlet-hole in ' the floor that the bell stood upon, and through a second ' floor in like manner; then horizontally under and near the ' plaistered ceiling of that second floor, till it came near a ' plaistered wall; then down by the side of that wall to a ' clock, which stood about twenty feet below the bell. The ' wire was not bigger than a common knitting-needle. The ' spire was split all to pieces by the lightning, and the parts ' flung in all directions over the square in which the church ' stood, so that nothing remained above the bell.

' The lightning passed between the hammer and the clock ' in the above-mentioned wire, without hurting either of the ' floors, or having any effect upon them, except making the ' gimlet-holes, through which the wire passed, a little bigger, ' and without hurting the plaistered wall, or any part of the ' building, so far as the aforesaid wire and the pendulum wire ' of the clock extended; which latter wire was about the ' thickness of a goose quill. From the end of the pendulum ' down quite to the ground the building was exceedingly rent ' and damaged, and some stones in the foundation-wall torn ' out, and thrown to the distance of twenty or thirty feet. ' No part of the aforementioned long small wire, between ' the clock and the hammer, could be found, except about ' two inches, that hung to the tail of the hammer, and about ' as much, that was fastened to the clock; the rest being ex- ' ploded, and its particles dissipated in smoke and air, as gun-

‘ powder is by common fire, and had only left a black smutty
 ‘ track on the plaistering, three or four inches broad, darkest
 ‘ in the middle, and fainter towards the edges, all along the
 ‘ ceiling under which it passed, and down the wall. These
 ‘ were the effects and appearances : on which I would only
 ‘ make the few following remarks ; viz.

‘ 1. That lightning, in its passage through a building, will
 ‘ leave wood, to pass as far as it can in metal, and not enter
 ‘ the wood again till the conductor of metal ceases.

‘ And the same I have observed in other instances, as to
 ‘ walls of brick or stone.

‘ 2. The quantity of lightning, that passed through this
 ‘ steeple, must have been very great by its effects on the lofty
 ‘ spire above the bell, and on the square tower all below the
 ‘ end of the clock pendulum.

‘ 3. Great as this quantity was, it was conducted by a
 ‘ small wire and a clock pendulum, without the least damage
 ‘ to the building so far as they extended.

‘ 4. The pendulum rod being of a sufficient thickness, con-
 ‘ ducted the lightning without damage to itself ; but the small
 ‘ wire was utterly destroyed.

‘ 5. Though the small wire was itself destroyed, yet it had
 ‘ conducted the lightning with safety to the building.

‘ 6. And from the whole it seems probable, that if even
 ‘ such a small wire had been extended from the spindle of the
 ‘ vane to the earth, before the storm, no damage would have
 ‘ been done to the steeple by that stroke of lightning, though
 ‘ the wire itself had been destroyed.’

Mr. *Francklin*’s opinion on this subject, is confirmed by
 the effects of lightning at *Darking* in *Surry*, related by Mr.
William Child in the next article.

The three next essays are furnished by that learned natura-
 list doctor *Stephen Hales*, who has always dedicated his excel-
 lent talents to the immediate service of his fellow-creatures.
 The first contains an account of the great benefit of blowing
 showers of fresh air up through distilling liquors. By means
 of an ingenious contrivance described in a plate, he blew up
 showers

showers of fresh air through the liquor in a still, and found that by this method, he distilled double the quantity of that which comes over the helm in the ordinary way. He recommends this process at sea, by which a tun of water may be distilled in twenty hours, with little more than two bushels of coals; and in the distillation to procure sweet water, he found that a small quantity of chalk was as effectual as the soap lees, used by Dr. Butler. He observes that coals will thus distil about eight times their weight of water; and that ventilation of sea water does not increase the quantity of salt that rises to the surface, or comes over the helm. Sea water that stunk, being distilled, became sweet again. Stone lime succeeded in sweetning salt water, as well as the *lapis infernalis* used by Mr. Appleby. Powdered chalk, in the proportion of half an ounce to a gallon, had the same effect. Ventilation, by increasing evaporation, will be serviceable in making common salt, pot-ash, &c. Ventilators may be commodiously fixed and worked in ships, without encumbering the decks, or being attended with any inconvenience; they not only preserve the health of the people, by exhausting the foul air, before it acquires a dangerous degree of putrefaction, but they likewise contribute to the preservation of the timber of ships laid up in ordinary in harbour. The salutary effects of ventilation have evidently appeared in several ships crowded with men, as attested by captain Thompson of the *Success* frigate, Mr. Cramond owner of a ship in the *Guinea* trade, captain Ellis, who used it in *Guinea* and in *Hudson's-Bay*, and lastly, by the earl of *Hallifax*, who ordered it to be used in several transport ships bound to *Nova-Scotia*. The method of blowing up showers of air, will cure milk of the ill taste derived from the cabbage on which cows feed, provided the milk be heated, before the operation begins. Ventilation sweetened the stinking purging water of *Jessop's* well, as well as stinking seawater: but it could not prevent the bad taste in the butter made from the milk of cows that drink stinking water. The doctor observes, that this method of blowing showers of air, may be beneficially practised in some marshy places, the stinking water of which produces agues: that fish may be carried alive several miles in the same water, by means of this ventilation

that supplies them with fresh air, without which they cannot live: and that tar-water may be freed from it's heating oil, by blowing showers of air up through it when it is scalding hot; so that the less volatile and more salutary acid will remain.

These observations are published by themselves, in a pamphlet printed for *Richard Manby* in the *Old Bailey*, with an appendix, containing several additional experiments and material improvements on the subjects of which he treats.

The 57th article, by *Thomas Barker*, Esq; contains a scheme for shewing in general the course of the comet, expected next year or the year following, illustrated by a copper-plate, exhibiting the circumference of a circle divided into degrees, for the *magnus orbis*: on the right point of the ecliptic and focal length, is drawn a parabola, like that observed in 1682 round the sun, the centre of the circle marked with every fourth day's motion from the perihelion and the line of it's nodes. The co-sine of the comet's inclination set off on perpendiculars to this, towards the several points of the parabola, forms the projection of it, or points in the plane of the ecliptic, over which the comet is at any time perpendicular. There is likewise a table, shewing where the comet may be expected to begin to appear any month.

The 58th article is made up of seven and twenty letters, describing an extraordinary agitation of the waters, without any perceptible motion of the earth (except in one instance) that was observed, on the first day of *November 1755*, when *Lisbon* was destroyed by an earthquake. This surprizing agitation was observed in seas, harbours, lakes, ponds, and pools, at *Portsmouth* in *Hampshire*, in *Sussex* and the southern parts of *Surry*, at *Guilford*, *Medhurst*, *Cranbrook* in *Kent*, *Tunbridge*, *Rotherhithe*, *Old-street* in *London*, *Reckford* in *Essex*, *Reading*, *Sherburn-castle* in *Oxfordshire*, *Plymouth*, *Mountsbay*, *Penzance* and other parts of *Cornwall*, *Swansey*, *Norwich*, *Yarmouth*, *Hawkeshead* in *Cumberland*, *Durham*, *Lochness* and *Lochlomond* in *Scotland*, *Kinsale* in *Ireland*, *Toplitz* in *Bohemia*, at the *Hague* and *Leyden* in *Holland*. The same phænomenon appeared with very little variation in all these different places. The water was agitated without any visible cause, suddenly retreating and returning again several times alternately.

The

The last article contains two and twenty Letters, giving details of earthquakes felt, about the same time, in *Derbyshire*, *Lisbon* and the neighbourhood, *Oporto*, *Madrid*, *Cadiz*, the coast of *Barbary*, *Madeira*, *Switzerland*, *Geneva*, *Boston* in *New-England*, *New-York*, and *Pennsylvania*; some of these letters are written with accuracy; but by far the greater part of them, as well as of those in the foregoing article, are superficial, unphilosophical, and unimportant; and seem to have been inserted with no other view, but to eke out the collection, or in the *French* phrase, *pour grossir la volume*.

ART. V. *An ESSAY on the TIMES.* 8vo. Pr. One Shilling.
Henderfon.

THE author of this pamphlet seems to have considered very properly, the critical situation of the times; upon which he argues politically with great judgment and precision.

He takes a retrospect of the treaty of *Utrecht*, and justly observes that the limits of our *American* possessions were at that time left unascertained; nor were they secured fully even by the peace of *Aix-la-Chapelle*. The delays, chicanery, and even insults of the *French* commissaries appointed to settle that very important point, their encroachments and contumelious usage of the *English* subjects in *America*, are topics upon which he justly descants, 'and yet, says he, have they (meaning the *French*) the impudence to traduce the *English* in every court in *Europe*, as the aggressors in the quarrel, or as if these had done any more than carrying on the war upon both elements, which they had begun upon one.'

He afterwards condemns our method of retaliating the injuries done us by the *French* in *America*; and tells us very reasonably, that making war upon a parcel of traders, who thought themselves sheltered by the laws of nations from such an attack, and this without any previous declaration of war, is a procedure which can be by no means defended.

'This (says he) was then playing the game the *French* wished directly into their hands. Hurt, as they were, by the transient damage we did to their mercantile interest, a point which,

' which, though especially of late highly considered by them,
 ' was never but subordinated to their general system, they bore
 ' it with even pleasure, hugging themselves in the irreparable
 ' damage, they justly knew we were doing ourselves in the
 ' opinion of the public, and in the fair handle they saw it
 ' would give them for repairing of *Dunkirk*, which had ever
 ' been their capital object, and the reproach for which from
 ' hence they treated as so premature, that the *French* king, in
 ' his manifest, made no scruple of giving the lie in the face of
 ' all *Europe* to the ministry here, without scarcely mincing the
 ' term: an usage, which, if undeserved, must in this nation
 ' create a resentment equal, if that were possible, to so enorm-
 ' ous an outrage, unless it should be utterly dead to that sensi-
 ' bility of honour, the loss of which is ever one of the surest
 ' and most deplorable symptoms of an approaching dissolution.'

In the 14th and 15th pages of this pamphlet, the very little
 service the treaty with *Russia* could have been of to the imme-
 diate interest of *Great Britain*, however *Han—r* might have
 thereby been benefited, is fully demonstrated; as well as the
 incomprehensibility of the immediate succeeding one struck up
 with *P—a*, whereby that made with *R—a* was effectually
 defeated.

His reflections upon the neglect of the soldiery are judicious;
 those on the navy are also worth attending to, and in the fol-
 lowing extract are contained too many melancholy truths.

' It must not have been, in those times, an undiverting
 ' scene, though rather of the lowest droll kind, to have at-
 ' tended one of your little men of power's levy, to have noted
 ' the figure and air of those animalcules who were plyers at it:
 ' to have seen wretches of birth, and fortune, without the plea
 ' of want, and valuing themselves only according to the price they
 ' proposed fetching at that infamous market, paying their court
 ' to one perhaps their inferior in every point, except that of
 ' power, which too was a scandal to themselves, as he might
 ' never have got into it, but for their abjection and supine re-
 ' missness in leaving that field open to him, of which they
 ' were afterwards mean enough to cringe to him for any little
 ' share of the harvest, he would please to allot them, on their
 ' selling themselves and country to obtain it. One sees, me-
 ' thinks!

‘ thinks ! one of those illustrious idlers, daubed over with embroidery, and perhaps betaudered with a ribbon, emphatically expressing, by his address, his hunger for a place or pension, somewhat in the manner of Plautus his sycophant :

‘ *Nunc si ridiculum hominem quærit quispiam,*
‘ *Venalis ego sum cum ornamentis omnibus,*
‘ *Inanimentis explementum quærito.*

‘ Yet out of the spiritless beggars of this stamp, vacancies of employs were often, if they could not, properly speaking, be called filled, at least so abusively bestowed, as to exclude those much worthier subjects who disdained to solicit for what, in all good policy, they ought to have been sought for, and courted to accept. Whilst the groveling mob of dependents, and subalterns, could naturally be no more displeased at seeing power and profit run in those muddy channels, than a shoe-boy at not seeing the streets clean, who is to get his livelihood by the dirt of them. The comparison may be low ; but can it be lower than the object of its application ? for what could be more favourable to such as they, than to see places of the most national importance within the reach of every thing but merit, that greatest requisite, and therefore the surest of exclusion, and now become even the sport, as it were, of chance or caprice, dealing them out at random, to some, for having perfunctorily discharged a provincial office without any affinity to public affairs, or any conversancy of theirs in them ; to others for the empty sound-sake of some name, once of account, but which nature never meant them to fill, or for some trivial insignificant circumstance, of no more relation, or proportion to the general system of things, than the shooting of *London-Bridge*, or taking a west-country barge with a man of war’s boat’s-crew, would be to the direction in chief of the Navy.

‘ Thus a mean, frivolous, and false taste universally prevailing, the times themselves being no longer favourable to the forming of great men for the service of their country, one might, amongst the eminent post-lollers of those times, have pointed out, more than one secretary of state that could not write, and ambassadors that could not speak.’

Though

Though our author presents us with this picture as of former times, it is much to be feared it may be reconciled to the present, for even in these days we have marked that

‘ Whilst the ruling band proceeded very solemnly, making capital points of trifles, and trifles of capital points; though one would have hardly thought them very tempting models of imitation, the times themselves look too strong a tincture of their worthlessness. All the liberal arts and sciences, whether of peace, or war, with their essential train of dependences, fell into neglect, and disregard, whilst they were so industriously cultivated in a neighbouring nation (whose follies alone were thought worthy of imitation, and that a most aukward one indeed!) and whose vices, though to the full as great, and as ripe as any where else, are however dignified, if that were possible, by some taste, and compensated by some virtues.’

What we have said of this pamphlet is sufficient to furnish the readers with an idea of its merits; for the rest we recommend them to peruse the piece itself, in which we can assure those who have any taste for politics, that they will find some pleasure.

It is written with spirit and correctness, and intermixed with an entertaining vein of irony. Upon the whole, it seems to be the production of a man of genius, who in some places affects a singularity of style that becomes him: if he has any fault, it is making, sometimes, his periods too long; and this perhaps may be owing to the corrector of the press.

ART. VI. *The Life and Memoirs of Mr. Ephraim Tristram Bates, commonly called Corporal Bates, a broken-hearted Soldier: Who, from a private Centinel in the Guards, was, from his Merits, advanced, regularly, to be Corporal, Serjeant, and Pay-master Serjeant; and, had he lived a few Days longer, might have died a Commission-Officer, to the great Loss of his lamentable Lady, whose Marriage he had intended to declare as soon as his Commission was signed; and who, to make up for the Loss of so dear an Husband, and her Pension, which then no Duke on Earth could have hindered, in order to put Bread*
into

into the Mouths of seven small Children, the youngest now at her Breast, the sweet Creatures being two Twins, publishes these Memoirs from the original Papers, sealed up with the Seal of dear Mr. Bates, and found, exactly as he mentioned in his last Will and Testament, in a Oven, never used, where, in his Lifetime, he secreted many State-Papers, &c. &c. &c. 12mo. Pr. 3s. Owen.

MR. *Tristram Bates*, the hero of this motley production, was a native of *Dorsetshire*, and from his infancy manifested a strong liking to a military life; as appears by the following letter, sent to his mother by the schoolmaster, who had the care of his education.

‘ Madam,

‘ Your Son has very good Parts, but applies them very
‘ strangely. People in the neighbourhood complain of broken
‘ windows done by him, which he calls storming their castles.
‘ When chickens are lost, and found on him, he says he only
‘ went a maroding. His books are all military, and what-
‘ ever he sees in them he instantly puts in practice. He
‘ cuts off their springs of water, so that their pumps are all
‘ dry in the parish; and when I punish’d him for it, though
‘ my arm is now tir’d of doing it, he cries, I read of the duke
‘ of *Marlborough’s* doing so. But, these are trifles. A neigh-
‘ bour’s sow, near her time, was decoy’d by him into his
‘ chamber, and fed till she farrow’d, and brought sixteen
‘ pigs: He invited his school-fellows to partake as long as
‘ they lasted, and now has turn’d the sow home. He was
‘ punish’d for this; but he stood to it that it was no crime
‘ to intercept an enemy’s provision. The owner, who had
‘ proposed paying his rent out of them, threatens law. Pray
‘ send me money to satisfy the fellow; and as soon as conve-
‘ nient order your son home. Who am,

‘ Your loving friend,

‘ Ebenezer Birch, *M. A.*

‘ Fellow of *Queen’s, Oxon*, and curate of —.

‘ P. S.

‘ P. S. I now teach *French*, dancing, music, and fencing,
 ‘ having learned a little of each when I was last in *London*.
 ‘ I have, also, advertis’d in the best *London* papers, which
 ‘ you will read (as, at your public house, I have too often seen
 ‘ the *London Evening*) and, for my parts and abilities, have
 ‘ fixt on some worthy and capable friends there,——cousin
 ‘ *Twist*, the rope-maker, in *Hemp-yard*——Mrs. *Cardinal*, the
 ‘ noted milliner in *Marigold-court*, by the *Strand*——nephew
 ‘ *Hyde*, currier——my good friend *Slice*, the eating-house in
 ‘ *Gun-powder-alley*——with many others.’

In consequence of this elegant epistle he was called home ; and soon after eloped with a recruiting serjeant, with whom he enlisted as a soldier ; whereby he entirely forfeited the good graces of his parents. Being skilled in gunnery and other branches of the mathematics, and having the highest notions of honour, he determined to advance himself in life ; and to owe that advancement to nothing but his own merits. In this view he was disappointed, being never able to rise beyond that rank under which we find him distinguished in the title page of this book.

The authors of the CRITICAL REVIEW, who are warmed with pleasure when a work of any merit falls in their way, and never condemn without regret, never, they hope, without justice, lament their being obliged to pronounce this book among those of the lowest class, with which either the caprice of the booksellers, or the partiality of writers have wearied out the public patience. From beginning to end there is nothing interesting ; no settled plan of adventure to engage the attention or warm the imagination ; we find the author attempts often, but in vain, to be witty ; and we have extracted the following passage, because it seems to be the highest pitch of humour to which he could strain his extraordinary talents.

‘ But the distant sound of drums from the city, one morning, engaged his attention, “ even there, perhaps, I may
 ‘ learn something, says he, though I fear it.” On enquiry,
 ‘ the valiant army of *London* was to be reviewed. I’ll go,
 ‘ says *Bates* : He arrives : dunghills are stormed : prisoners
 ‘ ransomed : mines sprung : batteries raised ; and dismounted—
 ‘ as

‘ as soon: and officers (if valour consists in lace or fringe) the
‘ most brave and intrepid of the universe. Says *Bates*, “ tho’
“ they know little, I would forgive that, as it is not their daily
“ trade, (only comes once a year) but why will they affect
“ to know so much?” For now endeavouring to explain
‘ some part of the manual exercise to a most noble lieutenant-
‘ colonel (common council man of *Candlewick* ward, and dry-
‘ falter) the fringed hero, with contemptuous eye, answers,
“ Mind your own business. The, city by their charter, are
“ free from such *warment* as you. Go back from whence you
“ came.” Sir! says *Bates*.——“ Sir! replies the colonel,
“ give me my title! have I no title? Aye and as good a one
“ as any lobster about the smoke of the palace. We can de-
“ fend ourselves without any courtier’s assistance (for you
“ seem by your fine talk to come thereabouts). We have as
“ brave an army as any the duke of *Marlborough* ever had un-
“ der him (barring numbers;) 10,000 fighting men, upon
“ occasion; headed, not by half starved beggarly officers of
“ the court,——No, no.——There’s a colonel! Where have
“ you such a one? He weighs at least a plumb.”——Weights
‘ says *Bates*.——“ Aye, solid gold.” “ Oh! I mistook,”
‘ says *Bates*.

‘ The word of command being soon to be given, the colo-
‘ nel, who was very loudly whisper’d by the serjeant to say,
‘ march—cries, “ no, it’s *July* yet.—Come, my lads!—walk.
“ —There’s men for you, says the colonel:—I thank heaven,
“ I have not a soldier in my own company, and I hope there are
“ none among the rest.—wheel.”——And so they did, by catch-
‘ ing hold of each others arms, and at last making an *Irish*
‘ ring. —“ There’s men, says the colonel.”——When now,
‘ calling for his beast, the better to survey the whole crooked
‘ line, (whether the beer he had that day drank, or whether
‘ the beef he had ate to breakfast, dinner, and afternoon-lunch-
‘ eon, or whether it was the natural tendency of his pate,
‘ but) on clamb’ring up the outside of his war-horse, he hung
‘ over his saddle, with his head downwards, like the sign of
‘ the golden fleece (for he was indeed all gold.) Thrice he
‘ essay’d to raise himself, thrice he failed; when descending
‘ again (the better to accomplish his design) some valiant ser-
‘ jeants,

‘jeants, who saw his distress with concern, ran to his assist-
 ‘ance; and (over eager to save the credit of the regiment
 ‘and their colonel) they jointly put their hands under his
 ‘crupper so violently, that he fell over the other side of his
 ‘horse, who luckily having been hard work’d in a colour-
 ‘mill, (for he borrow’d him that morning) stood quiet enough,
 ‘or Mr. Colonel must have been the only dead man that day,
 ‘except the many who were only dead drunk. *Bates*, now
 ‘to be a little revenged (the second time he was ever cruel in
 ‘all his life, *Mr. Paradox*’s scourging being the first) said,
 ‘Noble colonel, you had rather fall ten times, I believe that
 ‘way, than once in battle.” The colonel, now in wrath,
 ‘orders a file of musqueteers to turn him out of the field, as
 ‘a dangerous and suspected person,—crying, “when we want
 ‘you, we’ll send for you; we can defend ourselves by our
 ‘charter.”—*Bates* walked solitary home, thinking how ridi-
 ‘culous it is to appear in any character unfit for us; and con-
 ‘cluded by saying, “all the shame we feel in life is generally
 ‘owing to our endeavouring to pass for what we are not.”—
 ‘But this colonel, said he, had no shame.—Perhaps his face
 ‘was too red to admit of it.’

There are some characters here and there sketched from the life, and the following one of *Bladder* may be easily applied.

“Please your honour, says *Coborn*, a young lad, who
 “loves engineering and gunnery; has been in *France* on pur-
 “pose to improve, and is come here in pure good nature to
 “instruct us.” Damn him, says captain *Bladder*, (that was
 “the name of this bloated commander, and I shall never for-
 “get him or his name) ’tis a scheme; some frenchified pa-
 “pish, coming here to blow up the magazine, perhaps,—be-
 “sides, I don’t like your learning new ways,—we are skilled
 “enough;—no country has more knowing people in our way,
 “—have we not near 500 bombardiers? half as many mi-
 “ners? No, no,—send him packing,—I see into the fellow,
 “—he’s a bite,—follow the way you are taught,—’tis an ex-
 “cellent one,—you can never find a better;—we want no
 “instructions,—bid him take up his books of pothooks and
 “hangers,—we never use books,—all by the head, which

“ is more certain ;—there, use him well, says *Bladder*,—
“ but see him clear of the town ;—I’ll seal up his books of
“ gunnery, as he impudently, or rather foolishly, calls them,
“ and send them to the council,—I shall perhaps advance my-
“ self by it ;—he’s a spy,—and writes in cypher ;—the pro-
“ per officer shall have them,—and I warrant we’ll find him
“ out ;—buying powder, to be sure, is an excellent blind !
“ why, we have not a matrofs (much more an officer) but
“ would do as much.”—Then turning into his guard room,
‘ *Bates* saw him in less than half a minute, asleep in an easy
‘ chair, ordering himself not to be waked, and that they
‘ would not practise that evening, by any means, for fear of
‘ disturbing his repose, which, to be sure, he much wanted,
‘ for he rose about noon that day, and had only walk’d to the
‘ place where *Bates* was practising and back again.’

Upon the whole, the *Life of Corporal Bates* seems, if not the production of a fellow of the college of *St. Luke’s Moorfields*, at least the work of a correspondent of that respectable body, who here discharges a torrent of scurrility and invective, which like the venom of the toad, for that a toad has venom is still by some asserted, can never reach far enough to do mischief. We shall not here examine the looseness and want of connection of his materials ; neither shall we enter into a disquisition of his stile ; these are every where so obviously contemptible, so full of ignorance, and so open to ridicule, that to engage our reader in such a review would be an insult on his understanding. Our author is however happy in one thing, that is, the first part of his title : there are, both in army and navy neglected, and consequently broken-hearted, men of merit ; too many we fear, whom our miscarriages may at length teach us to prefer. In the mean time, we must declare this neglect a subject which wou’d appear to admirable advantage handled by a man of abilities.

ART. VII. *St. Peter’s Christian Apology, as set forth in a Sermon on 1 Pet. iii. 15, 16. lately published at the Request of the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Oxford, and other Heads of Houses, by Thomas Patten, D. D. Fellow of Corpus Christi College ;*

College; farther illustrated, and maintained against the Misrepresentations and Objections of the Rev. Mr. Ralph Heathcote, Preacher-Assistant at Lincoln's Inn. By the Author of the Sermon. Pr. 1 s. Rivington.

THE Reverend Mr. Heathcote, in a pamphlet entitled, *The Use of Reason asserted in Matters of Religion*, having attacked Dr. Patten's sermon preached before the university of Oxford, the Doctor, in the little tract before us, defends with much warmth and spirit the opinions which he had there advanced, and replies to Mr. Heathcote's objections against them. As we are not very fond of religious controversy, especially between such acrimonious disputants, our readers will we hope excuse our entering minutely into this:

Non nostrum est tantas componere lites.

We shall not however pass over this performance without a few extracts, which may serve to convey some idea of our author's merit, and to convince us that he has argued in some places not unlearnedly against learning, and not unreasonably against reason; and that he is not without parts and capacity, and greatly superior in understanding and abilities to any of that idle sect of * visionary enthusiasts whom he seems to have taken under his protection.

The advocates for human reason having asserted, that Christianity cannot be proved by its miracles to be a Divine Revelation, unless Christians can evince, that the nature, end, and purposes of it are conformable with certain supposed natural notions of religion and morality; the Doctor sets out with observing, that, to place the authenticity of the word of God on this footing must weaken, in a great measure, the weight and efficacy of it; because every man was by this theology admitted to sit in judgment upon every command and institution of God, and to interpret it according to his own reason, that is, his own fancy or opinion; and that the principles of natural religion, how clear soever we may suppose them to be, are not sufficient guides: because, their coincidence or repugnancy with the facts and doctrines of the Bible can never evidently appear, until the things of God

* The Hutchinsonians.

God shall be, what they cannot be unless he shall reveal them, compleatly known: God hath not thought fitting to indulge to mankind such an insight into his secret councils, as is requisite for explaining the grounds and reasons of his Revelation. Let those commands therefore (says Dr. Patten) and ordinances of God, whose grounds and reasons he hath not himself explained, nor directed us to explain, be received with the implicit obedience and reverence of faith. Human reason is weak in this point, from the want of proper *data* and materials to work withal; she therefore must have recourse to imagination and conjecture, which can only furnish her with ingenious guesses and uncertainty, instead of the decisive authority of the word of God, confirmed by the miracles to which it hath expressly appealed. Such are the learned Doctor's opinions concerning a point which we must allow to be of great importance; to these Mr. Heathcote can by no means assent: the contending writers have treated the subject at large, not without some degree of asperity on both sides. For a view of the whole we must refer our readers to the two pamphlets, extracting only a few passages of the Doctor's, which contain, in our opinion, that part of his arguments against Mr. Heathcote which appear most satisfactory.

‘ Let us proceed (says he, p. 47.) to Mr. Heathcote's third
‘ argument, which hath not indeed, like its fellows, mistaken
‘ the point in debate. For if we are really cautioned, (as this
‘ argument pretendeth to have proved) by the express authority
‘ of the Scriptures themselves, against resting the truth of
‘ Christianity upon the simple testimony of its miracles, then
‘ Mr. Heathcote's affirmation must be true, That miracles, singly
‘ considered, are not sufficient to establish the divinity of the
‘ Gospel.

‘ Where, then, do the Scriptures expressly caution us against
‘ resting the truth of Christianity upon the simple testimony
‘ of its miracles? If Mr. Heathcote can prove this, he will
‘ help infidelity to a compendious and effectual method of
‘ overthrowing the Scriptures, since we have produced many
‘ passages, wherein Jesus Christ resteth the truth of Christianity
‘ upon the simple testimony of its miracles; upon which footing
‘ it was likewise placed by his Apostles; so that, in this case,

‘ the Gospel will be found to stand in the opposition of *flat contradiction* to itself.

‘ The paragraph in which Mr. *Heathcote* hath asserted this extraordinary proposition, adduceth in proof of it three texts of Scripture, containing,

‘ 1. A caution of our Blessed Saviour, *not against resting the truth of Christianity upon the simple testimony of its miracles*, but against going after false christs and false prophets.

‘ 2. A caution of St. *Paul* against giving heed to St. *Paul* himself, or an angel from heaven, preaching any doctrine different from that of the gospel; supposing, not granting, that it were possible for an angel so to preach.

‘ 3. A caution of St. *John* against believing every spirit, because many false prophets, anti-christian spirits, were gone out into the world. Try therefore, saith he, what manner of spirit they are of; try whether it be the spirit of God, by the touchstone (not of eternal, unchangeable fitness, but) of the Gospel of *Jesus Christ*. “ For, hereby, addeth St. *John*, know ye the spirit of God: every spirit that confesseth that *Jesus Christ* is come in the flesh, is of God; and every spirit that confesseth not that *Jesus Christ* is come in the flesh, is not of God: and this is that spirit of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come, and even now already is it in the world.” 1 *John* iv. 1—3.

‘ Let the candid reader now, or let Mr. *Heathcote* himself, determine whether any of these three texts of scripture do caution us, in the most explicit terms, against resting the truth of Christianity upon the simple testimony of its miracles: nay whether they caution us against any thing else, than the forsaking of the Gospel, supported as it is by its miracles, and of *Jesus Christ*, its blessed author, upon any pretensions whatsoever.’

Again, p. 56. ‘ Mr. *Heathcote*’s argument (*says he*) supposeth the *Christian Apology* to assert, that the knowledge of facts can only be acquired by the testimony of our senses; leaving out the words *mediate or immediate*, which in both editions of the sermon stand before the word *testimony*, and evidently mean, in connection with it, the testimony of our own, or of other people’s, senses.

‘ 2. It

2. It pretendeth, that, from the *consideration* "that we cannot reason surely or effectively but upon the ground of facts," the *Christian Apology* inferreth "that we should rest the truth of Christianity upon its *miraculous* facts." Whereas this proposition, however asserted in the sermon, is not there asserted in consequence of the above *consideration*, nor supposed to have any connection with it.

Of this the candid reader will be convinced, who shall be pleased to turn to the 16th and 17th pages of the sermon. There the author, in order to shew (what he had undertaken to shew) the inability of the understanding to come at real truth by abstract reasoning, hath asserted, that the only path to this *real truth* is the *knowledge of realities and facts*; since the most successful comparing of such ideas as are not known to have any thing in nature correspondent to them, can only furnish the mind with *chimerical propositions* instead of *real truths*: that this knowledge of facts and realities can, *ordinarily*, come into the mind no other way than by the *mediate or immediate* testimony of the *senses*: that, consequently, *reason* cannot discover them; and accordingly, i. e. agreeably to this *consequence*, God did not leave it to *reason* to find out those realities which it was necessary for us to know, concerning his nature, his acts, and purposes; but communicated to us, as well those which could be attested by sense, as those which lie beyond the reach of it, "by declarations made to us by his Son, and by his apostles and prophets," who, that we might believe them to be sent from God, and might *implicitly* receive their informations, stamped them with the divine, authentic seal of astonishing and awful miracles.

I will not exclaim in the language of Mr. *Heathcote*, "What shall we say now to this assistant-preacher of ours? But I will say, that this gentleman having, as he conceiveth, gained a compleat victory, first by the help of a disingenuous quotation, and secondly by mistaking, or wilfully misrepresenting the point in question, insolently closeth this fifth argument with giving his adversary the *hard name* of *cabalistic theologue*, and wondering at his indiscretion "in venturing out of his thickness of cover into the broad, open paths of nature and common sense."

The Doctor, towards the conclusion of his pamphlet, presents us with the two following illustrations in support of his darling opinion, which he hopes may furnish satisfactory reasons for resting the proof of the reality of a revelation upon external evidence.

‘ Let us (*says he*) suppose *Abraham* to have laid down to himself this rule, recommended by Mr. *Heathcote*, of examining communications pretended to come from God, by the test of the plain, unerring dictates of common sense, the first and simplest principles of all morality and religion. According to this plan of proceeding, *Abraham* must have suspended his assurance that the voice which commanded him to slay his son for a burnt-offering, that this voice was a real revelation, until he should have examined the matter of the command, by the principles of natural religion, to try whether it was not contradictory to, or at least not inconsistent with, any of them. Until this should appear to him, the external evidence of a voice from heaven was not to be allowed any weight to prove that God was the author of this command; it might be a voice proceeding from the prince of the power of the air,

‘ *Abusing him to damn him* *.

‘ In this examination he would soon meet with two principles, which Mr. *Heathcote* will place high in the list of moral truths written on the invisible tablet of our hearts, “That parents are to love and cherish their children;” and, “That we are not to commit murder.” How, then, according to Mr. *Heathcote*’s examining system, will *Abraham* be defended from the imputation of enthusiastic, or, to use Mr. *Heathcote*’s favourite word, fanatic rashness, in receiving for a divine revelation, and obeying, a command so directly repugnant to the true criterion of revealed truths? Certain it is, that this procedure of *Abraham* was so shocking to a late reasoning divine of great hopes, who afterwards went into *Ireland*, that he scrupled not to say, “if he had been a justice of peace in the parish where *Abraham* lived, he would have put him in the stocks.”

* *Shakespeare, Hamlet.*

‘ In vain will it be said, upon Mr. *Heathcote's* plan, in
‘ defence of *Abraham's* conduct, that he had reason to depend
‘ upon God's former promises, and to believe that God, would
‘ raise his son from the dead: this is supposing him assured that
‘ the command was from God, when its failure on the test,
‘ its repugnancy to the *first and simplest principles of all mora-*
‘ *lity and religion*, compelled him to pronounce it an *imposture*.
‘ In vain also will it be alledged, that God may, in subse-
‘ quent revelations, dispense with the prescript of his *primary*
‘ *revelation*: this is again supposing the dispensation to come
‘ from God, which, by the never-failing *criterion*, is demon-
‘ strated to be altogether unworthy of him; not to mention
‘ that God, having, according to Mr. *Heathcote*, made that
‘ *primary*, the *touchstone of every subsequent revelation*, hath
‘ thereby abridged himself of the power of dispensing with it.

‘ Our second illustration for manifesting the necessity of
‘ resting the truth of revelation upon external proofs, is
‘ this:

‘ Let us divide the inhabitants of the globe, as Mr. *Heath-*
‘ *cote* hath divided the globe itself, not into thirty parts, but
‘ into as many thousands as they may be supposed to consist of;
‘ and then let us enquire whether there be one person in each
‘ of these thousands who hath any clear conception of this
‘ author's glaring *first and simplest principles* of morality and
‘ religion, or is at all qualified for this author's proposed ex-
‘ amination into the *reasonableness of its doctrines, and the*
‘ *worthiness of its ends and purposes*. Now what is to become of
‘ those vast numbers who are thus incapable of examining?
‘ Was not *the gospel preached to these poor* and ignorant crea-
‘ tures, as well as to philosophers? And yet, according to
‘ this author's scheme, they are utterly excluded from all pos-
‘ sibility of believing and embracing it. Will he tell us they
‘ are implicitly to *take philosophers for their guides*? This
‘ cannot be. He will not allow an *implicit* regard to be paid
‘ to what he acknowledgeth to be the word of God; much
‘ less then to the word of man. But supposing him to allow
‘ this, or rather (as his system will lead him) to contend for
‘ it: in this case a new difficulty will arise. They must ask
‘ what *class* of philosophers they are to follow? Christians and
‘ infidels,

' infidels pretend alike to have tried this gospel by the test
 ' of reason, common sense, and natural religion; and though
 ' *Prideaux, Rogers, and Mr. Heathcote* declare it to be, in all
 ' its parts, consistent with those *sacred canons, Shaftesbury,*
 ' *Tindal and Morgan* will declare directly the contrary. How
 ' is the poor untaught soul to decide between the two parties?
 ' Bare asseverations are, on each side, of equal weight in
 ' the scales. These therefore cannot determine him. Is
 ' he then to examine their several reasonings, to find on which
 ' side the truth lieth? Alas! he cannot read, nor hath the least
 ' conception of the meaning of the terms which make up their
 ' disputation. And if he *could* read, and understand, yet his
 ' life, were it of antediluvian length, would end before the
 ' controversy, which is now as much alive as ever it was, and
 ' leave him but partially acquainted with the pleadings of the
 ' several advocates, and consequently without any pretensions
 ' to give judgment upon the cause. Or if the whole pleadings
 ' lay actually before him, yet to suppose him able to deter-
 ' mine the controversy, would be to make him *wiser* than these
 ' philosophers who are *unable* to determine it, and who were,
 ' just now, appointed as his guides, because he was *not wise*
 ' *enough*. In short these millions of the vulgar, yea and
 ' these philosophers also, however raised in their own conceit
 ' above the vulgar, must, if Mr. *Heathcote's* be the true *manner*
 ' *of proceeding*, remain in a state of invincible suspense during
 ' their whole lives; no life being long enough for opening and
 ' explaining, even though we were masters of the proper
 ' facts, the grounds and reasons of every act or purpose, or
 ' law of God recorded in the scriptures, so as to demonstrate
 ' against all objections, that it is *consistent with our notions of*
 ' *the divine attributes, and not contradictory to any manifest*
 ' *truths natural or moral.*

' Nor is there any cure for this miserable uncertainty and
 ' suspense, but the decisive authority of those miracles which
 ' were wrought and appealed to for this very purpose of recom-
 ' mending the revelations of God in the old and new testa-
 ' ment to the reverential acquiescence of mankind.'

The Doctor then endeavours to obviate three insinuations
 by which Mr. *Heathcote* hath endeavored to discredit the plan
 of

of his *Christian Apology*, the *first* of which is, that the doctrine therein advanc'd is new-fashioned: *Secondly*, That it tendeth to encourage a spirit of indolence: and, *thirdly*, That it would explode the use of our intellectual powers. The Doctor vindicates his performance in answer to these three charges against him with some spirit, as the reader will perceive by what follows.

' The third article (*says he*) of Mr. *Heathcote's* charge is,
' that the sermon tendeth to explode the use of our intellectual
' powers. And yet, his only reason for asserting this is, that
' it hath cautioned the understanding from entangling itself in
' a trackless thicket; from attempting to fill the perforated tub,
' from spinning cobwebs, or unravelling them already spun,
' which are of *no substance or profit*; from affecting to soar
' on metaphysic wings into the void regions of abstraction,
' where

' ——— ——— ——— ——— ——— all at once
' *Fluttering her penons vain, plumb down she drops*
' *Ten thousand fathom deep;*

' and hath exhorted her to exert herself in the search of
' true learning, by *working upon matter, and limiting herself*
' *thereby*; especially in searching after that truth, which is,
' of all others, the most concerning; that truth, which is
' the *life eternal* of those who so know it as to embrace and
' trust in it.

' The sermon then hath not exploded the use of our in-
' tellectual powers in religion, but hath directed them to
' their just object and exercise, *the enforcing Christian truths*
' *by their own christian arguments*, and building the proofs of
' the divine origin of the gospel on the sure foundation of
' facts, communicated to us either by history, or by reve-
' lation.

' And let the reader determine whether *he* doth not endea-
' vour most effectually to explode the use of the intellectual
' powers, who contendeth for employing them in trifling,
' fruitless subtilties, instead of stable, effective reasoning:
' and whether the strength of *Hercules* was not more likely
' to be totally enervated by inveigling him to *spin* at the
5 L 4 ' distaff,

' infidels pretend alike to have tried this gospel by the test
 ' of reason, common sense, and natural religion; and though
 ' *Prideaux, Rogers, and Mr. Heathcote* declare it to be, in all
 ' its parts, consistent with those *sacred canons, Shaftesbury,*
 ' *Tindal and Morgan* will declare directly the contrary. How
 ' is the poor untaught soul to decide between the two parties?
 ' Bare asseverations are, on each side, of equal weight in
 ' the scales. These therefore cannot determine him. Is
 ' he then to examine their several reasonings, to find on which
 ' side the truth lieth? Alas! he cannot read, nor hath the least
 ' conception of the meaning of the terms which make up their
 ' disputation. And if he *could* read, and understand, yet his
 ' life, were it of antediluvian length, would end before the
 ' controversy, which is now as much alive as ever it was, and
 ' leave him but partially acquainted with the pleadings of the
 ' several advocates, and consequently without any pretensions
 ' to give judgment upon the cause. Or if the whole pleadings
 ' lay actually before him, yet to suppose him able to deter-
 ' mine the controversy, would be to make him *wiser* than these
 ' philosophers who are *unable* to determine it, and who were,
 ' just now, appointed as his guides, because he was *not wise*
 ' *enough*. In short these millions of the vulgar, yea and
 ' these philosophers also, however raised in their own conceit
 ' above the vulgar, must, if Mr. *Heathcote's* be the true *manner*
 ' *of proceeding*, remain in a state of invincible suspense during
 ' their whole lives; no life being long enough for opening and
 ' explaining, even though we were masters of the proper
 ' facts, the grounds and reasons of every act or purpose, or
 ' law of God recorded in the scriptures, so as to demonstrate
 ' against all objections, that it is *consistent with our notions of*
 ' *the divine attributes, and not contradictory to any manifest*
 ' *truths natural or moral.*

' Nor is there any cure for this miserable uncertainty and
 ' suspense, but the decisive authority of those miracles which
 ' were *wrought and appealed to for this very purpose* of recom-
 ' mending the revelations of God in the old and new testa-
 ' ment to the reverential acquiescence of mankind.'

The Doctor then endeavours to obviate three insinuations
 by which Mr. *Heathcote* hath endeavored to discredit the plan
 of

of his *Christian Apology*, the *first* of which is, that the doctrine therein advanc'd is new-fashioned: *Secondly*, That it tendeth to encourage a spirit of indolence: and, *thirdly*, That it would explode the use of our intellectual powers. The Doctor vindicates his performance in answer to these three charges against him with some spirit, as the reader will perceive by what follows.

' The third article (*says he*) of Mr. *Heathcote's* charge is,
' that the sermon tendeth to explode the use of our intellectual
' powers. And yet, his only reason for asserting this is, that
' it hath cautioned the understanding from entangling itself in
' a trackless thicket; from attempting to fill the perforated tub,
' from spinning cobwebs, or unravelling them already spun,
' which are of *no substance or profit*; from affecting to soar
' on metaphysic wings into the void regions of abstraction,
' where

' ——— ——— ——— ——— ——— all at once
' *Fluttering her penons vain, plumb down she drops*
' *Ten thousand fathom deep;*

' and hath exhorted her to exert herself in the search of
' true learning, by *working upon matter, and limiting herself*
' *thereby*; especially in searching after that truth, which is,
' of all others, the most concerning; that truth, which is
' the *life eternal* of those who so know it as to embrace and
' trust in it.

' The sermon then hath not exploded the use of our in-
' tellectual powers in religion, but hath directed them to
' their just object and exercise, *the enforcing Christian truths*
' *by their own christian arguments*, and building the proofs of
' the divine origin of the gospel on the sure foundation of
' facts, communicated to us either by history, or by reve-
' lation.

' And let the reader determine whether *he* doth not endea-
' vour most effectually to explode the use of the intellectual
' powers, who contendeth for employing them in trifling,
' fruitless subtilties, instead of stable, effective reasoning:
' and whether the strength of *Hercules* was not more likely
' to be totally enervated by inveigling him to *spin* at the
5 L 4 ' distaff,

‘ distaff, than by tasking him to those manly exercises for
 ‘ which his limbs were naturally formed.’

The pamphlet concludes thus :

‘ If I return once more to Mr. *Heathcote*, it is to conjure
 ‘ him by all his hopes of everlasting happiness to think more
 ‘ worthily and justly than he seemeth to think of that lively,
 ‘ *energetic faith*, to which the scriptures admonish us to *trust*
 ‘ *entirely* for salvation, but which he who exhorteth Christians
 ‘ to trust to, is by Mr. *Heathcote* charged with enthusiasm
 ‘ and fanaticism.

‘ Let him but take his idea of the nature and spirit of
 ‘ Christianity, not from the fancies of the ingenious, who
 ‘ have been affecting to surprize by new discoveries, but from
 ‘ the sincere word of God, and he will perceive, (if he
 ‘ earnestly seek to know the truth) that the gospel of *Jesus*
 ‘ *Christ* was intended for an infinitely more important purpose
 ‘ than to improve our moral knowledge ; and that Christianity
 ‘ is not truly understood, even by the wise and penetrating,
 ‘ till its good seed hath taken root in their *hearts*, till it hath
 ‘ begun to wean their affections from this world, and to make
 ‘ them know Christ and the power of his resurrection, and
 ‘ seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth at
 ‘ the right hand of God. He will then perceive that by what-
 ‘ ever proofs the word of God is recommended to our *intel-*
 ‘ *lectual* faith, yet if another faith do not spring up within
 ‘ us, that word will, after all, prove unfruitful. While
 ‘ the vanities and follies of the world, while the raging
 ‘ thirst of pleasure, or wealth, or honour keep possession
 ‘ of our desires; while pride, or malice, or self-conceit dis-
 ‘ dain to yield to a meekness and lowliness of heart, which
 ‘ our Blessed Saviour is ever ready to teach us by the silent
 ‘ instruction of his good spirit ; vain and trifling to us are all
 ‘ our examinations of his doctrines, all our arguments for their
 ‘ truth. They may, by God’s grace, convince others, they
 ‘ will not convince ourselves; we are yet to seek for true
 ‘ faith in Christ, and the true meaning of his gospel. He
 ‘ only who is disposed to do his will, shall truly know of the
 ‘ doctrine whether it be of God. The knowledge *which availeth*
 ‘ *unto salvation*, (*which alone perhaps deserveth that name*, be-
 ‘ cause

' cause all other knowledge shall vanish away) is to be sought
' not 'inter sylvas academi,' in the woods, the endless intricacies
' of sceptical disputation, but in an honest, and good, and penitent
' heart, inflamed with an earnest desire to hear, and a stedfast
' purpose to obey the will of God.'

What Dr. Patten has advanced in some parts of his pamphlet, concerning the necessary limitation of human reason, is not unplausible: but he seems, in many others, very unwilling to rest contented without the utter *expulsion* of it; probably (as hath been intimated by an * excellent writer) with a design to

* The author of *A free and candid examination of the bishop of London's sermons*: who, in his preface to that work, takes occasion to speak of Dr. Patten's *Christian apology* in the following terms: 'To vindicate the rights of reason in religion (*says he*) appears now so desperate an adventure to the learned of Oxford, that in a sudden fit of despair, as it should seem, they are for giving up the cause at once, and ridding us of all our labour at a blow. The scheme is to expel *reason* out of the province of *faith*: and to believe on no other account but because it is thus written: that the data for the truths of revelation are so slender, that the application of human reason to it only makes it totter the more; for that all which human reason can do is to furnish out topical arguments; which as they have two handles, two faces, and two edges, are laid hold on equally by the two parties; who with the same ease and facility turn them against one another, till the conflict ends in an universal scepticism. The learned doctor, who has made this important discovery, concludes therefore that human reason is that carnal weapon, which the apostolic men most of all disclaimed; and which it is now high time, after having done so much mischief with it, to throw finally aside.

' There is still more behind. The subtle doctor has apparently communicated but one half of his scheme, and mysteriously keeps the other in reserve: for we can never suppose his intention is to leave religion quite defenceless. We must conclude therefore, that tho' he has not thought fit to tell us what security he has provided for religion, yet at least that something he has in petto, ready to supply the place of reason, as soon as ever we shall be disposed to give it up.

' Now, what this something is, we can but guess. There are two famous sects of nominal christians, to whom reason having given as great offence, as it has happened to do to our learned doctor; they have both acted on his exterminating principle. The sects I mean are the quakers and the papists: but then, both of them have, in their several ways, provided for the security of religion, in the absence, or during the captivity of reason.

' The quakers have substituted the spirit in its stead. And, indeed, suppose them not to have juggled with us, and they have made

to substitute something else in the room of it. There is besides in this gentleman's performance, an acrimony and bitterness of resentment, which we are always sorry to find in men of abilities; especially as part of it hath unluckily fallen on the authors of the CRITICAL REVIEW, which, in justice to ourselves, we are here obliged to take notice of.

Page 85, our readers will meet with the following severe animadversion :

' This is not an age in which one must hope for candid and
' sober judgments, especially concerning books written on re-
' ligious subjects. Few readers are to be found who examine
' while they read, and who determine to hear both sides before
' they

' made no ill exchange for us. " Why should you, wretched
' earth-worms, (say these men to us) keep groping out your way
' by the weak and feeble glimmering of human reason, when you
' have the light within; the glorious light of the spirit rising in
' your souls? Reason indeed is good, when nothing better can be
' had. It served the philosophers. But shall their old stale ware
' serve the saints? Purge out, for shame, this old leaven, that you
' may be a new lump." Now, these illuminati ascribing so much
' more to human reason than our *Oxford* divine, and indeed talking
' so much more soberly concerning it, I conclude that the thing
' which he keeps in reserve, and is so shy of producing, is not the
' spirit.

' It remains then to see, if it be that with which the papists have
' done such wonders. I mean, the arm of flesh, whether distin-
' guished by the titles of Inquisitions, wholesome Severities, solemn
' Leagues and Covenants, Acts of Conformity, or by what other
' name whatsoever it may be called, as different times and places
' hold most commodious or salutary. Now there are many cir-
' cumstances which plainly indicate the great secret to be this, and
' no other. For 1st, the learned doctor agrees with them in the most
' lavish abuses of human reason; especially when it submits to the
' guidance of private judgment. 2^{dly}, His spite and rancour, like
' theirs, is chiefly directed against such whom human reason is sup-
' posed to have favoured most. 3^{dly}, He condescends, as the pa-
' pists have ever done, (and which the quakers, to do them justice,
' never did) to borrow aid of this enemy of all godliness, as often
' as it may serve his purpose. From the sameness in these various
' characteristic marks I am inclined, and I hope without breach of
' charity, to conclude, that the learned doctor's prime object, like
' theirs, is the peace, rather than the purity, of religion: and
' consequently that he has a more substantial support for the church,
' than that slender pillar of the light within: which, when he
' pleases to explain at large, he will, without all question, meet
' with the encouragement he deserves.'

‘they pronounce upon a controverted point. Even they who
‘assume the title of CRITICAL REVIEWERS will frankly
‘confess, after all their professions to the contrary, that they
‘give their account of an author’s doctrines and principles,
‘from the representation of his adversary, and, taking it for
‘granted that this representation is just; will, without hesita-
‘tion, break out into bitter revilings of the writer, for a
‘work which, by their own account, they have never read.

In answer to this dreadful accusation we must refer our readers to the account of Mr. H——’s book in our number for *April*, where all that is said of Dr. Patten will be found in one short paragraph (see No. III. p. 271) and is no more than this; ‘The discourse, (Dr. Patten’s) if we may be allowed to
‘judge of it by our remarker’s extracts, was doubtless a pret-
‘ty extraordinary performance.’

This is what the Dr. calls *breaking out into bitter revilings*: wou’d not any of our readers imagine, by the expression, that we had exhausted some pages in a scurrilous abuse of him? But he is likewise very angry with us for condemning *what, by our own confession, we had never read*: now, tho’ it is evident that the doctor cannot possibly tell whether we had read his sermon or not, yet certain it is, that we were not obliged to do it, Mr. H——’s extracts from it were the only things we had any business with, as the discourse itself (*being publish’d before the commencement of our work*) did not fall under our inspection: but the doctor was angry with us before because we did *not* read his works, and who knows but he will be as angry now because we *did*? He will however be forced to acknowledge, that we have dealt more candidly by *him* than he hath by *us*: we shall therefore take our leave of him, with this advice; that he wou’d remember for the future, to temper the sprightliness of his fancy, and soften the edge of his resentment with the mild suggestions of cool and unprejudiced *reason*, which will at least be serviceable to him in *this* life, however insufficient he may esteem it in regard to the more important concerns of *the next*.

ART,

ART. VIII. *An account of Conferences held, and Treaties made, between major-general Sir William Johnson, Bart. and the chief sachems and warriors of the Mohawks, Oneidas, Onondagas, Cayugas, Senekas, Tuskaroras, Aughquageys, Skaniadara-dighronos, Chugnuts, Mahickanders, Shawanese, Kanuskagos, Toderighronos, and Oghquagoes, Indian nations in North America, at their meetings on different occasions at Fort Johnson, in the county of Albany, in the colony of New-York, in the years 1755 and 1756. With a letter from the rev. Mr. Hawley to Sir William Johnson, written at the desire of the Delaware Indians. And a preface, giving a short account of the Six Nations, some anecdotes of the life of Sir William, and notes illustrating the whole; also an appendix, containing an account of conferences between several quakers in Philadelphia, and some of the heads of the Six Nations, in April 1756. 8vo. Pr. 1s. 6d. Millar.*

EVERY body knows how much we owe to the valour and conduct of Sir *William Johnson* in *America*; of these the blasted laurels of *Dieskau*, and the signal defeat of our enemies, on the 8th of *September 1755*, bear glorious testimony.

By the pamphlet now before us we find that this hero might have shined in the cabinet as well as the field, had he, in early life been thrown in the way of it. In the following extract from the preface, there is an account of this gentleman, with which we think the reader will not be displeased.

‘ Sir *William Johnson*, Bart. was born in *Ireland*, and is
 ‘ nephew of the late Sir *Peter Warren*. His uncle, while
 ‘ captain of a twenty gun ship of war, stationed at *New-*
 ‘ *York*, the year I cannot ascertain, married a lady, a native of
 ‘ that city. Soon after, he purchased large tracts of land in
 ‘ that colony, and sent to *Ireland* for his said nephew, then
 ‘ about seventeen or eighteen years of age, whom he put in
 ‘ possession of a considerable part of it, lying contiguous to
 ‘ the *Mohawk* country. By a constant residence there ever
 ‘ since, and by pursuing, with indefatigable industry, every
 ‘ prudent measure, that occurred, he has many years since im-
 ‘ proved wild, woody lands into plentiful rich farms; thereby has
 ‘ had the pleasure of living in a neighbourhood of wealthy far-
 ‘ mers

‘mers and industrious tradesmen, all his own tenants; who
‘were first invited thither by him, and from the lowest cir-
‘cumstances, have arrived to what they are, by the liberality
‘of his purse, and the wisdom of his instructions.

‘Besides the attention his estate demanded, which must
‘have been considerable, he, till very lately traded largely as a
‘merchant with his *Indian* neighbours, and more especially with
‘our *Indian* traders, who go every spring from *Albany*, and
‘other parts, to *Oswego*; where multitudes of *Indians* from
‘distant regions assemble, and barter beaver skins, &c. for
‘*European* commodities. These the principal traders used to
‘take from Sir *William*’s store, on credit, as they passed by
‘his door in their boats on the *Mohawk* river, in their way to
‘*Oswego*; and pay for them on their return, the ensuing fall,
‘in the goods they got in exchange.

‘As our trade with the *Indians* is of great advantage to us, and
‘had in him one of its principal supports, I should with much
‘regret have heard of his declining business, had I not known,
‘that the perfidy and ambition of a restless and dangerous
‘neighbour, and the good of his country, called him to action
‘in a nobler sphere. Few merchants had faith like him, to
‘trust large effects in the hands of young, raw and unexpe-
‘rienced men, whom he chose to encourage for their industry;
‘indeed few could, none having such a capital, nor any in
‘the country so large an assortment: add to this, that his
‘house, very properly called *Fort Johnson*, is situated above
‘30 miles back from *Albany* by land, a great way farther by
‘water; which considerably lessen’d the expence, trouble and
‘time of the traders, and consequently enabled them to deal
‘to better advantage. But what rendered him of yet more
‘utility, in this respect, was, that in all his transactions he
‘ever acted with so much openness and integrity, that those
‘who once dealt with him thought themselves happy in im-
‘proving the correspondence.

‘For many years he has been colonel of militia in the coun-
‘ty of *Albany*; and about six years ago he was appointed
‘one of his Majesty’s honourable Council of the province of
‘*New-York*; thence is he stiled *The Honourable* in this book.
‘He is turned of forty years of age, of stature near six feet,

‘of

‘ of a most comely aspect, and is every way well form’d for
 ‘ the most manly exercises. Notwithstanding what I have said
 ‘ of him, should I be asked, Whether he has any enemies in
 ‘ the circle of his acquaintance? I would answer, What is
 ‘ the natural, the unavoidable consequence of merit? Is it not
 ‘ to be envied?’

It is plain from this collection of treaties, that the *British* nation owes more to the industry and application of General *Johnson*, than the generality of people are apprised of; and had all our other officers in *America*, as well civil as military, been endued with talents equal to his, and animated by the same spirit of glory and patriotism, our affairs in that part of the world had before this time worn a very different aspect. However let us not despair; there is no room for it when we remember the very great abilities of the noble Governor of *Virginia*, from whom we may expect much, if care is taken to supply him properly from home. We have a specimen of General *Johnson's* oratorical powers in what follows.

‘ *February 20, 1756.*

‘ Present at the following public speech

‘ The hon. <i>William Johnson</i> ,	‘ Lieut. <i>Pottinger</i> ,
‘ sole superintendant of their	‘ Lieut. <i>Lee</i> ,
‘ affairs.	‘ Lieut. <i>Kennedy</i> ,
‘ The Rev. Dr. <i>Ogilvie</i> ,	‘ Lieut. <i>Mills</i> ,
‘ The Rev. Mr. <i>Hawley</i> ,	‘ Ensign <i>Penington</i> ,
‘ Capt. <i>Beckwith</i> ,	‘ Several <i>Indian</i> officers, and
‘ Lieut. <i>Miller</i> ,	‘ other gentlemen,
‘ Lieut. <i>Dunbar</i> .	‘ Three Interpreters.

‘ Brethren of the six united nations, your allies and de-
 ‘ pendants,

‘ It always gives me the most solid pleasure to meet you here,
 ‘ that we may felicitate ourselves in the cherishing warmth and
 ‘ light of that fire, kindled here for our mutual good; may it
 ‘ ever burn bright as the sun that illuminates and guides the
 ‘ day, that you and your posterity, to the latest generations,
 ‘ may rejoice in its benevolent influence!

A belt.

‘ Brethren,

‘ Brethren,

‘ It gives me a particular satisfaction to meet you here at this
‘ time, for two important reasons. The first is, that it af-
‘ fords us an opportunity of a friendly interview under the
‘ shade of that tree, which was lately so solemnly and
‘ judiciously planted; and of calmly consulting and maturely
‘ deliberating matters of the utmost consequence, which near-
‘ ly concern our mutual welfare and honour.

‘ A belt.

‘ The second is, that it gives me an opportunity of shaking
‘ you by the hand with a brotherly affection, and in the name
‘ of the great King your Father, congratulating you upon our
‘ late happy success, which I make no doubt must give you
‘ the most sensible pleasure; and I flatter myself from your
‘ late repeated protestations of fidelity to your brethren the
‘ *English*, it will prove a means of animating you, and all
‘ your faithful allies, to stand forth with your usual bravery
‘ upon all future occasions.

‘ A belt.

‘ How much greater might our success have been! how
‘ much more sensibly would it have been felt by our treacher-
‘ ous and common enemy, had more of your warriors appear-
‘ ed in the field on that important day, had all our force been
‘ united? If the bubbling or drops of our war-kettle did so
‘ much, how great would have been the consequence, had it
‘ boiled with its usual fury! It would, like a mighty torrent,
‘ have carried all before it; and it would have sounded the fame
‘ of our victorious arms far and near, and spread universal
‘ terror all around us!

‘ I, now, in the name of the great King your Father, in
‘ this public manner return you thanks for joining our arms
‘ last summer, and for your gallant behaviour in that action.
‘ This gives him reason to expect the like fidelity and coura-
‘ geous conduct from you all for the future, and greatly endears
‘ you to him, and to all his loving subjects your affectionate
‘ brethren.

‘ A belt.

‘ This animates me with fresh pleasure and affection at this
‘ important conjuncture of affairs, to brighten and strengthen
‘ the covenant-chain, that has so long linked us together, in
‘ mutual

‘ mutual friendship and mutual affection, which, I hope, will
 ‘ continue inviolable and sacred, as long as the sun shines,
 ‘ or the rivers continue to water the earth, notwithstanding
 ‘ all the intrigues of our old and perfidious enemies, who have
 ‘ left no means unessayed, and especially at this time, to
 ‘ weaken and divide us, that so they may in the event root
 ‘ out the remembrance of your name and nations from the
 ‘ face of the earth.

‘ A large covenant-belt.’

There is an appendix to this pamphlet, giving account of some conferences between several of the quakers of *Philadelphia* and the heads of the six *Indian* nations; to this appendix is prefixed a short defence of that people by way of advertisement.

It would be unfair and defrauding the reader of great satisfaction, which he may reap from perusing the pamphlet, should we quote any more of it, than we have already done. Upon the whole, it appears to be a work worthy the attention of every person, who is desirous of knowing the true state of our alliances with the several *Indian* nations in North *America*. And whoever was the publisher is a well-wisher to his country, and claims our thanks.

ART. IX. *Institutes of Natural Law; being the Substance of a Course of Lectures on Grotius de Jure Belli et Pacis. Read in St John's College, Cambridge, by T. Rutherford, D. D. F. R. S. Archdeacon of Essex, and Chaplain to her Royal Highness the Princess Dowager of Wales. Volume the First. In which are explained the Rights and Obligations of Mankind considered as Individuals. 8vo. Pr. 5 s. Thurlbourn.*

THIS performance is extended to two volumes, divided into chapters of contents, and seems to be written with great accuracy and precision. The subject, dry in itself, is handled with perspicuity: the maxims are plain, the illustrations clear and conclusive, and the style nervous and unaffected.

In

In the first volume are explained the rights and obligations of mankind, considered as individuals.

He begins with the definition of a law, from *Grotius*; distinguishes between laws and permissions; observes that laws are divided into natural and voluntary; explains the cause of moral obligation, by which we are bound to practise piety towards God, justice and benevolence in respect of mankind, and chastity and temperance with respect to ourselves. These causes are, *first*, the general desire of happiness; *secondly*, the fear of evil; and, *thirdly*, the belief of future existence, howsoever supported, whether by reason or revelation.

Then he considers voluntary laws, either divine or human; thus divine voluntary laws are such rules as we are obliged to observe by the immediate command of God. He shews, that some of the precepts of the *Mosaic* law were local, and could not be observed in any place but *Jerusalem*; and then he establishes this criterion: 'Since all such actions as are good in themselves, in the sense already explained, are called virtues; and all such, as are bad in themselves, are called vices; we may say in general, that all virtues are moral duties, and all vices are moral crimes; or that virtue and vice are the matter either of the law of nature, or of God's moral law, which enjoins the former, and forbids the latter. But such actions, as are indifferent in themselves, such as in their own nature are neither virtuous nor vicious, are the proper matter of God's positive law; they become duties, when he commands them, or crimes, when he forbids them.'

Now the experience and the nature of mankind, may discover this natural difference between good and bad actions, or between virtue and vice; and consequently it is possible for mankind, by the use of their reason, to trace out the rules of moral duty; not that he would exclude revelation, which facilitates the progress of the human understanding.

In the 11th section he tells us from *Grotius*, that, 'human voluntary laws are of three sorts; either the civil law, or a law of less extent which is not derived from the civil power, or a law of greater extent than the civil law. The civil law is a rule established by the civil power, to which the subjects of any nation, who are under the authority of its civil power, are

' obliged to conform their behaviour. By the civil power we mean
 ' that power which governs what in latin is called *civitas*, in
 ' english a state, a nation or a civil community. And by a nation
 ' or civil community, we mean a complete or perfect society of
 ' men, who are in possession of their personal liberties, and have
 ' united themselves into one body for the purposes of securing their
 ' rights, and of promoting a common interest. The name *civil*
 ' law is now almost appropriated to the civil law of the *Roman*
 ' empire; as this has long been called so by way of eminence,
 ' whenever we speak of the civil law, we are supposed to mean
 ' this. But whenever I have occasion to speak of this law, I
 ' shall call it the common law, and shall use the words *civil law*,
 ' in the most extensive sense, for the law of the land in each par-
 ' ticular nation or country, that is, for the law which the civil
 ' power in that nation or country has established.

' Human voluntary laws, which are of less extent than
 ' the civil law, and are different from it, as not being derived
 ' from the same power, are the rules which any one, who
 ' has authority over others, different from civil authority,
 ' prescribes to those whom he has a right to command. Such
 ' are the rules which the master of a family prescribes to his
 ' children, or to his servants. The obligation of this sort of
 ' laws does not extend so far as the obligation of civil laws;
 ' for the former extends only to the family, of which the
 ' father or the master is the head; the latter generally ex-
 ' tends to all the members of the civil community. Or if
 ' in any instances the obligation of the civil law seems to
 ' be confined within narrower limits; yet even in these in-
 ' stances we may plainly distinguish it from the law, that
 ' we are now speaking of; if we only attend to the autho-
 ' rity from whence the law is derived. Thus military law,
 ' tho' it is confined to the army, is to be reckoned a part of
 ' the civil law, because it is derived from the civil power.
 ' The particular laws of any body corporate, which is but a
 ' part of the civil community, differs from the civil law only
 ' as a part differs from the whole; because the power, which
 ' such a body corporate has to make laws for itself, is granted
 ' to it by the civil government.

• The

‘ The law of nations is a law of greater extent than the civil law, and is not derived from the civil power. By the law of nations, we mean such rules as nations or civil societies are obliged to observe in their intercourse with one another. There are several points relating both to civil laws, and to the law of nations, which want to be explained. But our business in this chapter was only to give the reader a general notion of laws, to shew him the several sorts into which laws may be divided; and to bring him acquainted with the general matter of the law of nature. Such points as relate to civil laws, or to the law of nations, shall be explained in their proper place.’

In the second chapter he settles the meaning of the word *right*, in its different acceptations. He demonstrates, that it sometimes means a quality in actions; but commonly, a quality in persons. Then he makes a proper distinction between rights that are perfect, and rights that are imperfect. Our right is perfect, when we can carry it into execution without breaking in upon the rights of other men; but it is imperfect, if the rights of other men stand in the way of it, so that we cannot carry it into execution without breaking in upon them. Obligation and right are correlatives. Where any person has a right, some one or more persons are under obligation, which corresponds to that right: and, on the contrary, where any person is under an obligation, some other person or persons have a right which corresponds to that obligation.

He observes, that as justice consists in doing no harm to others, all the precepts of justice are negative, and consequently of the perfect sort; but as kindness and favour consist in doing good, the precepts of benevolence are affirmative, and upon that account the obligations to such duties imperfect. He goes on to explain the maxims of natural law, which are often injudiciously applied: he points out those actions that are void: he divides rights into natural and adventitious, alienable and unalienable; and distinguishes between things that are corporeal, and things that are incorporeal.

In the third chapter he treats of the nature of property, which is an exclusive right of things, empowering the proprietor to exchange, give, or throw them away. He concludes,

cludes, that all things originally belonged to all mankind in common; and that the exclusive right of property was introduced by some act of man. He says, that in a community of goods, a right to use them supplies the place of property; but he enumerates the inconveniences that attend a community of goods, which inconveniencies are remedied by property; and, by a very ingenious conjecture, supposes *Jubal* to have been the inventor of possession. ‘Supposing the
‘ reasons for introducing this expedient to have been rightly
‘ assigned, (*says he*, p. 45.) we should look for the origin of
‘ property amongst them, whose wants were the greatest,
‘ who were most scantily provided for, and who were least
‘ likely to practise the duties of benevolence and equity towards
‘ one another. All these circumstances concur in the posterity
‘ of *Cain*. Their ancestor had killed his brother; and his
‘ fears, lest the rest of mankind should punish this crime
‘ upon him and his posterity, induced him and his family to
‘ unite themselves together, and to build a city for their de-
‘ fence. By living in society, their manners were polished;
‘ and a refined way of living was introduced amongst them.
‘ This seems to be evident; because we find, that they
‘ were the inventors of arts and sciences, both of such
‘ as are useful, and of such as administer to pleasure.
‘ *Tubal Cain* was the instructor of every artificer in brass
‘ and iron; and *Jubal* was the father of all such as handle
‘ the harp and organ. This family had separated them-
‘ selves from the rest of mankind, and were shut up together
‘ within a narrow district: where, if there had been but
‘ a few of them, and they had been contented with coarse
‘ fare and ordinary cloathing, they would have found it diffi-
‘ cult enough to supply themselves. But the difficulty was
‘ rendered greater, not only by their elegance and luxury,
‘ but by the constant increase of their numbers. We
‘ have no reason to imagine, that this family had any great
‘ sense of duty: it is much more likely, that, as they lived
‘ with a bad parent, the influence of his example had in-
‘ disposed them to observe the rules of equity and benevo-
‘ lence in their behaviour towards one another. Here there-
‘ fore

‘fore we are to look for the beginning of property, or of an exclusive right to things. And the sacred historian informs us accordingly, that “*Jubal* was the father or inventor of “possession.” Yet property could not be introduced consistently with justice, unless by the common consent; and this compact is called division: or in consequence of a man’s having taken and kept possession without molestation, and such a tacit agreement is called occupancy.

Our author, in explaining the introduction of property, differs in opinion from Mr. *Locke*, who says, ‘that labour exercised on things moveable and immoveable, invests the labourer with the exclusive property of the said things.’ Dr. *Rutherford* has, we apprehend, fully demonstrated the fallacy of Mr. *Locke*’s reasoning on this subject, and plainly proves, that, ‘supposing the labour of him who cultivates the land to be worth ninety-nine parts in a hundred of the whole value of the land, after it is cultivated, all that could be due to the labourer would be no more than the produce of his own labour: the ninety-nine parts which belong to him would not swallow up the hundredth part, to which he had originally no exclusive right.’ Even making a thing does not convey a right to the maker, unless the materials were his own. He divides acquisitions of property into original and derivative: the first begins the property of things that were common; but derivative acquisitions are such as convey the property of things from one person to another. Then he distinguishes general property from particular property: and shews how far property is lost by dereliction or extinction of the proprietors.

The fourth chapter treats of the limitations of property, in respect of continuance, use, and disposal, arising from the proprietor, or some other person; in respect to services, which are divided into personal and real. The principal personal service is usufruct; which takes place only in goods that may be used without being consumed, such as lands, houses, slaves, horses, books, &c. Real services are certain advantages which one man has over the estate of another. Such as the right of letting his house rest on another’s wall; of receiving dropping water;

conveying water through spouts or gutters into another's yard; of jutting or shooting out, of extending buildings so as that they shall hang over another man's ground; of building houses to a certain height; of making windows into another person's yard or garden; of prospect, by which a man is intitled to look into another's estate; of carrying water-pipes and sinks through a neighbour's house; of enjoying pathway, drift-way, and road. There are, besides, other limitations in respect to disposal.

In the next chapter our author discusses our common right to things; such as the ocean, large banks of sand, and the air, which cannot be divided by boundaries, wild beasts, birds and fishes; though the right to these may be restrained as to its exercise: then he explains the right of extream necessity, where a man, in order to save his life, takes victuals which belong to another person; when he pulls down his neighbour's house, in case of fire, to preserve his own, or cuts another man's cables with which his own boat is entangled, and in danger of sinking: the right on shipboard of compelling an individual to bring out his stock of provision in a scarcity; or, in a storm, of obliging each person to throw a certain proportion of his goods into the sea, for the preservation of the vessel: and, *lastly*, the right which a nation at war has to seize upon, and garrison a place of strength in a neutral country, when it is morally certain that the enemy would otherwise get possession of it, and by that means be enabled to do them irreparable damage. Then he considers the right of harmless profit, namely that of passing over land or rivers in search of a new settlement, or for the convenience of commerce. This, he observes, is a right of the imperfect sort, and they upon whom it is exercised, are at liberty to judge for themselves, how far it is convenient for them to allow it to take effect.

The 6th chapter turns on derivative acquisitions, which are made either by the act of man or by the act of the law. Mutual and notified consent of parties, are necessary in derivative acquisitions by the act of man. Alienation may be revoked before acceptance; and acceptance may go before alienation.

alienation. He observes that property may be continued after death by a will, which is nothing more than a conditional alienation to take place on the event of the testator's death, without affecting his property in the thing disposed of till this event happens; that the right of making a will is incidental to property, and consequently co-eval with it; yet such property in goods, as enables a man to give them away by will, must be full property, at least, it must not be limited in respect of disposal.

Chapter 7 treats of derivative acquisitions by the act of law. Property transferred is done either by the law of nature, or some positive law. Property is acquired by the law of nature, either to satisfy some claim of strict justice, or to supply an heir to a person who dies intestate. He observes, that intestate successions need some other support beside the law of nature, which though it obliges a man to maintain his children, will not counsel him to leave his effects among them; and as they have no direct claim upon his goods, even during his life-time, their claim of maintenance can give them no right to his goods after his death. Nor does inheritance arise from the general consent of all mankind; but, it is the effect of civil laws established in different nations. Yet in the introduction of intestate successions, regard is had to a man's personal duty, and his children stand first in the succession. Where he leaves no children, his parents are entirely left out, on the presumption that he has no parents in being.

He shews that *Philo* is mistaken in his interpretation of the *Mosaic* law, when he says, that the father is not excluded from the succession. He demonstrates, that the order of succession may be varied by civil laws; that the succession of children may be cut off by disinheritance; that uncertainty of birth hinders a child from succeeding to an intestate parent; that infants, idiots, and madmen are naturally incapable of property; contrary to the assertion of *Grotius*, who imagines these are made capable of accepting and retaining property by the common consent of mankind, which considers them as part of the human species. That, therefore, which is called the estate of an idiot, infant, or madman, would be common

to the first person who should seize it, were not such a seizure expressly prohibited by law, and the property taken into custody by the law, and guarded for the benefit of him who would be the owner of it, if he was capable of property.

Prescription is the subject of the eighth chapter, being a right to a thing acquired by long, honest, and uninterrupted succession; a right founded upon the presumed dereliction of the former proprietor. He observes, that prescription extends to incorporeal things, such as jurisdiction and sovereignty. He mentions some reasons for believing that prescription has been established by an universal law; observes, that the time must be long enough for presuming that the former owner was not hindered from putting in his claim by ignorance or by fear; but must have had frequent opportunities of knowing both what his right is, and who was in possession of it, and frequent opportunities likewise of releasing himself from any restraints which might have forced him to be silent as to his claim; and he proves that prescription holds against persons unbo.n.

The next chapter explains the obligations arising from property, and the nature of restitution. In the subsequent chapter, he treats of the right which a man has in his own person, including an independent power of acting as he thinks proper. He says, the law of nature is the only original restraint upon a man's power of acting; that liberty is not unalienable; that restraints upon liberty by the law of nature are of three sorts, arising from our duty towards God, our duty towards mankind, and our duty towards ourselves, with the particulars of which, it will not be amiss to present the inconsiderate reader.

‘ But it is proper to consider, how far we have a right to
‘ dispose of our person, or to manage it in any manner, that
‘ we please; whether our liberty, or the power of acting as
‘ we think fit, is, in respect of ourselves, under no restraint
‘ from the law of nature.

‘ It seems to be self-evidently true, that no man can have a
‘ right to manage his own person, or to dispose of it in such
‘ a manner, as will render him incapable of doing his duty.

‘ For

‘ For his duty is a restraint, which arises from the law of nature :
‘ he cannot therefore have any right to free himself from that,
‘ unless he has a right to free himself from all restraints, which
‘ the law of nature has laid him under. The consequence of
‘ this is, that a man’s right to his life or his limbs is a limit-
‘ ed right; they are his to use, but not his to dispose of. As
‘ they were given him to use, whoever deprives him of them
‘ does him an injury. But then, as they are not his to
‘ abuse or dispose of, it follows, that he breaks through the
‘ law of nature, whenever he renders himself incapable of
‘ complying in any instance with that law, which the author
‘ and giver of his life and limbs, has required him to ob-
‘ serve.

‘ Upon this account we have no right to maim ourselves;
‘ if by such an act we shall become unable to discharge any
‘ of the duties of justice or benevolence. And much less
‘ have we any right to kill ourselves; since by this means we
‘ become unable to discharge any duty at all. A duty, which
‘ we can release ourselves from at pleasure, is unintelligible;
‘ it is in effect no duty: the law of nature could not in any
‘ respect be binding upon a man, if we suppose him to have
‘ such a right in his own person, that he may at any time, by
‘ his own voluntary act, lawfully release himself from the
‘ whole obligation of it, or in any respect render himself incap-
‘ able of performing it.

‘ Upon the same principles we may easily understand, that
‘ all such luxury or intemperance, in eating or drinking, as
‘ either fills up too much of a man’s time, and takes him off
‘ from his duty, or by disordering his understanding, clouding
‘ his judgment and impairing his health, incapacitates him for
‘ the performance of such duty, are not within the bounds
‘ of his liberty; his power of acting, as he thinks fit, is re-
‘ strained in these instances by the law of nature.

‘ Some duties of chastity are plainly such as respect not
‘ only ourselves, but likewise other men; because a breach of
‘ those duties is an injury to others. Of this sort are adul-
‘ tery, and rapes; to which we may add the debauching vir-
‘ tuous

‘ tuous women ; because those women are thus deprived of
 ‘ their credit and reputation, and the peace and quiet of their
 ‘ family and relations are broken in upon. The consent of
 ‘ the woman, who is debauched, can no more excuse the in-
 ‘ jury, than the consent of a person, who is cheated out of
 ‘ his property, can excuse the fraud. To raise and enflame
 ‘ her passions, till it is not in the power of her reason to con-
 ‘ trol them, and then to take the advantage of that weakness,
 ‘ which he, who debauches her, has been the occasion of;
 ‘ is the same thing in effect, as to mislead a person’s under-
 ‘ standing, and then take the advantage of his ignorance to
 ‘ cheat him out of his property.’

‘ There are other breaches of chastity, which the law of
 ‘ nature forbids ; because they frustrate that end, for which
 ‘ the desire of the sexes towards each other was implanted
 ‘ by nature. Amongst these breaches of chastity, besides those
 ‘ of the grosser sort, we may fairly reckon common prostitu-
 ‘ tion, and the debaucheries of such, as indulge their lusts
 ‘ with common prostitutes.’

In the 11th chapter *Dr. Rutherford* considers parental au-
 thority. He proves that this authority is not founded on the
 act of generation in the father, as *Grotius* affirms, but upon
 the duty of the parents, who are bound by nature to maintain
 their children. He observes, that the authority of the father
 is superior to that of the mother. He explains the three di-
 visions of childhood ; the nature of parental authority, which
 ceases in the second part of childhood, that is, when the child
 has attained maturity of judgment ; the honour due to parents
 in the third part of childhood, after the child has joined itself to
 another family, for he takes the word childhood not in the com-
 mon acceptation, but as a term implying the relation between
 parents and children. Then he takes notice that the variations
 in parental authority shew the origin of it. He fixes the bounds
 of natural minority, expatiates upon the right that parents have
 to punish and correct their children, and points out some cases
 in which the parents have a right to sell their children, name-
 ly, When they can no otherwise provide for their subsistence.

Lastly,

Lastly, He explains the difference between adoption and purchase.

The 12th chapter turns upon the subject of promises; what they are, how far they are obligatory: that they always relate to future time; that they do not affect the heirs of the promiser. That there is no obligation from promises where there is no liberty; or where the thing promised cannot possibly be performed; where it is unlawful, or arbitrary, or contrary to a former promise. He demonstrates that the obligation of a promise may be in suspense; that promises are not to be evaded by a supposed tacit condition of circumstances continuing the same, that is, when the time of performance comes, it shall be as convenient to the promiser to make good his word, as it was at the time of promising: That promises of infants, ideots, and madmen are not binding; That promises become binding by acceptance; so that a promise, after it is made, may be recalled without injustice, provided this revocation is made before the promise is accepted. That signs of consent, in promises, and acceptance, are necessary; and the best established declarations of either, are words or writing: That fear makes a promise void in some instances and not in others: That where some mistake in the promiser is the only real and true cause of his making the promise, the obligation of such promise is void: That we are obliged to stand to a promise which another person makes for us, where we have given him, either a general commission to act for us in all things, or a particular commission to act in this affair. Then he describes what promises may and what may not be recalled, when they pass through a third hand; and points out the effects of acceptance by another, either with or without commission.

From promises he proceeds to the consideration of contracts, including the nature and obligations of a loan of inconsumable goods, of a commission, of a charge. He observes, that contracts of mutual benefit, either share the matter or make it common: that the incapacity of either party to be obliged, voids a contract: that if either party has received more than he has given an equivalent for, he has received what the other
never

never designed or consented should be his, consequently he has no claim to what he has so received, and the contract is either void, or must be corrected: That equality in the previous acts, relates to knowledge and freedom; in the principal act, to knowledge of the price: that equality in the matter relates to faults in the goods, or errors in the price, unknown to either party. He considers the notion of price, and the variations of it; and concludes, that the want of a thing is the foundation of its price, consequently the price will vary, as the want varies. He sums up the advantages arising from the introduction of money; proves that metals are the most proper materials for money; and that the use of money varies the price of goods, by being in itself either scarce or in plenty. Then he enlarges upon the nature of buying and selling, letting and renting, letting and hiring of labour, and the loan of consumable goods. He afterwards defends the practice of taking interest for money, though contrary to the *Mosaic* law. Explains a question relating to a loan, when the value of money is changed before the day of payment. Having discussed this point, he makes a transition to the nature of insurance, mixed contracts, loss and gain in partnership, and partnership mixed with insurance. He considers a contract of one party's bearing the whole loss without any share in the gain; he compares work and money in partnership: shews how contracts are dissolved; explains the nature and obligations of contracts of chance, such as wagers or gaming of any sort: Demonstrates the invalidity of contracts by which we engage to give money, or some other thing of value, or to do some beneficial act, in consideration, that he, to whom we so engage, shall give us, or shall do for us, what we might have claimed without any such contract; as well as the invalidity of those contracts where the matter is unlawful.

In the 14th chapter we find a very curious dissertation on the nature of oaths, the obligation to fidelity and veracity, the concealments that are not inconsistent with this obligation. We are allowed by our silence to conceal what we have no mind to discover, provided the person who wants to make the discovery

discovery had no previous right to know the truth. We are at liberty in directing our discourse to a man, as if we designed to inform him of the truth, to speak what we know is untrue, provided we are sure that he waves his right of knowing it; thus a prisoner may plead not guilty to a crime, though he is conscious of having committed it, because the court does not desire to know the truth, unless they can make it out without his immediate confession. A physician is not bound to tell the truth to his patient, nor a commander to his soldiers; nor is it unlawful to deceive infants, ideots, and madmen, for their own benefit, or that of others; nor for an author to write fables; nor for a man to dissemble for certain purposes, such as shutting his door for the sake of being private, that people may imagine he is not at home. Thus a student may lawfully secure himself from interruption, an author from duns and bailiffs; and a general may fairly foil his adversary by the stratagems of war. A man may deceive an impertinent intruder, who listens to private conversation, and an impudent fellow who insists upon knowing what he has no right to know. In considering the nature of oaths, the Doctor observes, ‘It was not uncommon, amongst the antients, for persons to swear by other things, without the mention of God, as by the sun, the stars, or the heaven; by their own life, the life of their children, or the life of their prince. Oaths by the sun, the stars, or the heavens, seem to have been introduced, when these were imagined to be divinities. But such an oath in the mouth of a christian looks like profaneness: and I should not so much enquire, whether he was guilty of perjury in not keeping it, as whether he was not guilty of affronting God in taking it. Unless indeed where a person, out of reverence to the name of God, abstains from using it, and means, when he swears by heaven, to swear by that God, whom we have been taught to call our father, who is in heaven. *Sander-son* imagines, that to swear by our own life, or the life of our children, or the life of our prince, is tacitly swearing by that God, from whom these blessings were received. But certainly amongst the antients, who used these forms, this

I

‘ was

' was not supposed to be the import of them. The juror
 ' meant indeed to invoke the divine vengeance upon himself,
 ' if he falsified ; but he did this by devoting to destruction what
 ' was, or what he pretended to be, of all things most dear
 ' to him. This, which is the opinion of *Grotius*, appears to
 ' be true from some passages, that *Puffendorf* has cited from
 ' the antients for this purpose. When *Regulus*, as the story
 ' is related by *Pliny*, had persuaded *Verania*, that she would
 ' recover from her illness ; she called for her will, and made
 ' *Regulus* her heir ; it appears from the sequel by what sort of
 ' an oath he had attested the certainty of her recovery ; for
 ' when *Verania* was soon after this in her last extremities, she
 ' exclaimed against him as a perjured villain, who had for-
 ' sworn himself by the life and safety of his son. *Pliny's* re-
 ' flection upon it, explains the intent of such an oath. *Re-*
 ' *gulus*, says he, makes use of this stratagem not more fre-
 ' quently than wickedly ; whilst he every day deceives the
 ' gods, to whose wrath he has devoted this unhappy son of
 ' his. *Lyfias*, in one of his orations, introduces the daughter
 ' of *Diagiton*, and widow of *Diodotus*, offering to swear by
 ' the children both of her former and her second marriage,
 ' that *Diodotus* had committed to the trust of *Diagiton* five ta-
 ' lents ; to which she adds, I am neither so abandoned nor
 ' so covetous, as to leave the curse of perjury upon my
 ' children for the sake only of leaving them a maintenance.
 ' When the king of the *Scythians* is sick, he sends, says *Hero-*
 ' *dotus*, for three of the most approved public diviners to en-
 ' quire into the occasion of his distemper : and their usual an-
 ' swer is, that such or such a person has forsworn himself by
 ' the royal palace ; for amongst the *Scythians*, this oath by the
 ' king's palace is reckoned of all others the most sacred. From
 ' this last mentioned form we may collect, both that swear-
 ' ing by the king's palace was understood to be the same as
 ' swearing by the king's person ; in like manner as our Sa-
 ' viour interprets an oath by the temple to be an oath by him
 ' that dwelleth therein. And we may from thence collect
 ' likewise, that such an oath, by the king's person, was un-
 ' derstood to devote his person to some calamity, if the juror
 ' falsified.'

He says, credit is due to an idolater's oath, provided the juror is firmly persuaded that the being by which he swears is the true God; that oaths may be taken by proxy; and then he settles the difference between an oath and a vow. By an oath God is called upon to see the performance of what we promise, or to the truth of what we affirm, and to punish us if we are found to be perfidious and false: so that an oath does not, properly, contain in it any new and distinct obligation, but only confirms the obligation of some other act. But a vow is a pact, in which there are no others concerned, besides God and the person who makes the vow. It is a promise made directly to God himself, and is therefore such an act, as produces a distinct obligation upon the maker of it. He allows that an oath is void, when the pact is so with which it is joined: that an oath to a robber is binding, if there is nothing unlawful in the matter of the oath, nor any injustice in the manner of procuring it. That the effect of an oath does not extend to the heirs of the juror; and that oaths to do harm, are not binding as vows.

The 15th chapter concerning marriage, we, in a particular manner, recommend to the perusal of our readers of all denominations, whether married or unmarried, whether disposed or averse to matrimony. They will find that polygamy is inconsistent with the notion of marriage; that the principal end of each party in marriage, is the production of children from the body of the other, and the happiness that each expects in the conjugal affection of the other. Therefore that in contracting marriage they make over the full possession of their bodies to one another; so that a man cannot enter into the same contract with two or more women at the same time, because he must make over his whole body as an indivisible property to each, consequently be guilty of a palpable contradiction. Nor can his engagement, of consulting the happiness of his first wife, be fulfilled, if he bestows any part of his affection upon another woman, or alienates any part of his fortune from the children of the first marriage. Dr. Rutherford seems to think that polygamy was forbidden in the *mosaic law*, notwithstanding that precept in *Deuteronomy*; if a
man

man have two wives, one beloved and the other hated, &c. and the practice of the patriarchs. He supposes that the children to which this law alludes, were the children of two wives, one of which succeeded at the death of the other; and that those who practised polygamy, transgressed the law: as it was afterwards forbidden by the gospel. Then he expatiates on the nature of divorce, which is forbidden by the law of nature. Yet marriage is dissolved by adultery, though not by ill usage. A second marriage is null, while the first subsists. Impotency on the part of the man, and the woman's incapacity for the rites of consummation, will set the contract aside, provided these defects will admit of no remedy. By proper assistance, however, the man's generative faculties may be restored and improved, and the woman rendered capable of consummation. The Doctor next considers the validity or invalidity of marriages between persons nearly related to one another. He observes that a marriage between the father and daughter, or between a mother and a son, would supersede the duty of children to their parents; as the necessary familiarities which marriage supposes, are wholly inconsistent with that reverence which is implied in the notion of a child's honouring its parents. This is the only natural reason that can be advanced against such alliances: for the notion of instinct is absurd: but, as this reason does not operate against marriages between brothers and sisters, there is nothing unnatural in that conjunction; and he judiciously supposes, that the legislator, in prohibiting such marriages, intended to have mankind as free as possible to chuse for themselves. 'A father or mother might consult some particular conveniences of the family, rather than the inclination of their children; and whatever interest or caprice determined them to bring about a marriage between two of their children, they would easily be able to accomplish such marriage, if the brother and sister could make a valid marriage: because both the parties are under their authority and direction, and might not only be unduly influenced by such authority, when they were arrived at maturity, but might, even during their minority, be contracted to one another by the act of their parents.'

A marriage may be annulled by force, or an error in the contract, when a man stipulates for one woman and another is imposed upon him. Yet if a man stipulates to marry a woman, with the proviso that she is a virgin, and afterwards discovers that she is not a virgin, the Doctor seems to think the contract would hold, because he must give her possession of his person, by taking possession of hers, before he can make this discovery; and by so doing he gives up his conditions, and binds himself absolutely.—But, no offence to the learned doctor, we apprehend a man may make this discovery, without giving her possession of his body.

Perhaps it would be more for the peace of families, that proper inquiries were made into those affairs before consummation; and yet such inquiry would be attended with great danger and uncertainty. He takes notice, that the want of the parent's consent is not always sufficient to make a marriage void: he derives the husband's authority over the wife, from the presumption of his superior skill and experience; though the subjection of a wife was appointed by positive institution, as a punishment for that crime, into which the first husband was seduced by the first wife; that it might be a standing lesson of humility to all future wives, reminding them, that through the weakness of their sex, a curse has been entailed upon the whole species.—Hear this, O ye wives, and be meek, humble and obedient!

He concludes this chapter with an account of antient concubinage, which he supposes to have been a kind of marriage which a woman contracted under some disadvantageous conditions, in respect of herself and her children.

The subject of the 16th chapter is the right of defence; in which are considered the foundation of that right, which is indefinite in its extent, and not confined to injuries, but extending to all cases where we are likely to suffer any causeless harm, even though there is no criminal design on the part of the assailant, or of him, who, unless we were to prevent it, would be the immediate, though perhaps the innocent, cause of our suffering such harm. He shews how the right of defence is affected by benevolence; that if a man is attacked, he has a right against the aggressor, to do whatever is necessary for preserving himself from the hurt intended him; that

if, in his own defence, he should destroy an innocent person, who might stand in the way, so as to hinder his flight or interfere with his defence, there would be no injustice on his part, and the death of that person must be looked upon as a natural misfortune: a man has a natural right to repel a blow or a box on the ear, by any means which the aggressor makes necessary. Then the Doctor proceeds to investigate the nature of what is called honour; which he defines, 'a sense of the esteem or regard of mankind, a desire of raising and preserving in them an opinion of our worth and excellence.' He explains the foundation of those absurd mistakes which arise in matters of honour; and, among the rest, mentions that of confounding courage with honour, in those men who are prodigal of their lives, to gratify their revenge.—It were to be wished that *Dr. Rutherford* would teach the world to think rationally on this subject; for nothing can be more absurd than to suppose, that a man's virtue or worth ought to be measured by the extent of his courage; and yet a man's honour and fame are generally judged from this nonsensical criterion.

Our author makes a transition from honour to the defence of our goods, and descants upon the distinction which the laws of *Moses*, of *Solon*, of *Plato*, and of the twelve Tables, have made between a thief who robs in the day, and a thief who robs in the night.

In the next chapter he treats of reparation for damage done, or the right, in those who have suffered an injury, to demand reparation; he explains the nature of estimating damages; proves that accessaries to an injury are obliged to make reparation; instructs us how to demand damages from a number of principals; and demonstrates that reparation is due for the consequences of an unlawful act. He who has maimed another, does not make him full reparation, unless he pays for the cure, gives him the value of what he has lost, by being rendered incapable to earn so much by his labour, as he might have earned if he had not been maimed, and further pays for the loss of his time. If a man has debauched his neighbour's wife, besides indemnifying the injur'd husband from maintaining the spurious offspring, he ought to pay for depriving the husband of his wife's affections, for disturbing the

the peace of his family, and bringing disgrace and infamy upon it.---He describes the proper reparation for debauching an unmarried woman; for theft, slander, neglect or damage arising from unskilfulness and imprudence.

In the next chapter he enlarges upon punishment, the primary end of which is, to prevent the criminal from offending again; and the two secondary ends are, to amend the criminal, and deter others from following his example. He affirms that extraordinary tortures, in capital punishments, are unjustifiable.---We are of a different opinion.---That the only actions which we have a right to punish, in the liberty of nature, are those which are naturally unjust: we cannot punish ingratitude, irreligion, and intemperance, when they hurt none but those by whom they are practised. Nor are criminal intentions punishable, even after they are confessed. He defines guilt, 'that quality in a criminal, which deserves punishment, or which gives mankind a right to punish him.' But, as far as men are concerned in punishing, we may define guilt to be a disposition to do harm, which has shewn itself by some actual harm already done; and according as his disposition to do harm is stronger or weaker, the guilt of a man is greater or less in the same proportion. Then he lays down a proper distinction between the guilt of the crime and the guilt of the criminal. The guilt of a crime is greater or less, according as the crime, in its own nature, does greater or less harm. There are some circumstances attending the criminal act itself, which will aggravate the guilt of it; such as impiety towards a parent, inhumanity towards a friend, or ingratitude towards a benefactor. In considering the nature of punishment, he observes that retaliation, though it may be proper in some instances, cannot be the universal standard of punishment, because in certain cases it is impracticable, and in others it would be indecent and criminal. An incendiary, for example, who has no house nor effects of his own, cannot suffer the same evil which he has brought upon others, by burning their houses and goods. Forgery of a will, or treason, cannot be punished by retaliation. An adulterer, who has no wife of his own, cannot be punished in this manner; or if he had one, the law of retaliation, instead of correcting one crime, would engage others in the same guilt. Where we have sufficient

evidence that a man is disposed to injure us, the law of nature allows us to provide for our security; by enforcing the criminal's duty upon him, or by so restraining him, as to leave him either no opportunity or no power to transgress. This is the end proposed in punishment, which justifies us in inflicting it: and certainly the measure and degree, in which we may punish, can only be determined by that end which justifies us in punishing in any degree. On the article mercy, *he says*, that though the facility of a crime, when considered in itself, may rather seem to lessen than increase the guilt, because he who can take the pains to offend where great difficulties are in his way, shews a stronger disposition to offend, than he who meets with few or no difficulties to oppose him; nevertheless the facility of the crime is a reason, why we should carry our punishment of it as high as justice will allow of: for where a crime is easy and open, it is more likely to be committed, than where it is difficult; and if we punish in order to secure ourselves, there is more reason for punishing with all just severity, where we are guarded by nothing but the fear of punishment, than when we are guarded by the very difficulties which any person would meet with, who should attempt to injure us. When a criminal is punished with loss of goods, such goods have no particular owner; but, after restitution has been made to the person robbed, the remainder reverts to the public or collective body. Among accessories, he enumerates those who command a crime, who consent to it, who assist the immediate actor, who protect the criminal, who being, in strict justice, obliged to forbid the crime, do not forbid it; who being obliged to assist the sufferer, wilfully neglect to assist him; who advise, encourage, or countenance what is done; those who being in duty bound to dissuade the crime, do not dissuade it: and those, who being bound to make it known, nevertheless conceal it. After having canvassed the question, whether a criminal's deprivation of goods, is not an injustice to his children who had no share in his guilt? and explained how far a bondsman can be liable for a criminal; he concludes the chapter, by proving that obligation to punishment does not descend to the heir from the ancestor.

What follows is a short dissertation upon war, including a description of private war; and proving that war is naturally

lawful in those whose interest is immediately concerned, either to defend himself or his property, or to recover reparation of damages, or to inflict punishment.

The last chapter of the first volume, treats of slavery; establishes the difference between despotism and parental power; and asserts, that no man is naturally a slave. Then he numbers up the causes of slavery: a man may be enslaved by the act of his parents; by his own consent; by doing damage, for which he has no other way of making reparation; and by guilt: nevertheless, the master, merely upon account of that right which we call despotism, cannot dispose of his slave's life at pleasure. Then he shews in what manner slavery may be the consequence of just war; and why the children of slaves follow the condition of their mothers. Thus ends the first volume.

[To be continued.]

FOREIGN ARTICLES.

ART. X. *La Coquette Corrigée, &c. The Reformed Coquet.*

A Comedy. As it has been several times acted at Paris with great success.

THE merits of this piece lie rather in sentiment, conduct, and stile, than in intricacy of plot, comic pleasantry, or variety of incidents: hence, on the first night of representation it went off but heavily; strengthened however by some happy corrections, it succeeded better at the next representation. People of taste, who had once seen it, thought the pleasure worth renewing. Such is the constant effect of works whose beauties are founded on a solid basis; whereas such as are light and frivolous, tire upon repetition.

La None, the actor who wrote this comedy, and plays one of the principal parts, on its being first represented, previously intreated the indulgence of the public, more especially as he was cruelly obliged to be present at, and superintend the whole action, exposed to every possible mortification; whereas other authors have the advantage of concealing themselves, and from some obscure corner marking the exhibition. This address was received with applause, and the piece heard with attention.

In the first scene we find *Clitander* conferring with *Orphisa* concerning a letter she had just received from *Julia* the coquette, *Orphisa*'s niece, wherein he was severely rallied upon his supposed passion for the aunt. The latter informs him, that he had inspired her with this notion, as a first step to her reformation. The heart of *Clitander* had been long bias'd in favour of *Julia*, but the levity of her character had deterred him from addressing her, to which he is now encouraged by *Orphisa*, who relies upon the honour, affection, and amiable qualities of *Clitander*, to fix the regard of *Julia*; which the better to secure, she is to use every means in her power of increasing her jealousy; it being that young lady's disposition to look with a jealous eye upon every person who carries away any attachment from herself.

Erastus is the next person that appears upon the stage, complaining of *Julia*'s having used him very ill, after having artfully seduced his love from *Lucilia*; to whom *Clitander* engages him to return, moderates his indignation against *Julia*, and dissuades him from printing her letters. Then appears a positive, testy, shallow-witted court, who is also one of the coquet's admirers, and whom she had induced to believe that him she preferred to all her youthful lovers. His nephew, who is a marquis, congratulates him upon his conquest, and sends him off in high spirits to pursue it. Then *Clitander* and the marquis fall into discourse about *Julia*, and lay open still more of her character to the audience; just at that time she crosses the stage in pursuit of some new intrigue, but stops to jest with the marquis and *Clitander*; while the latter, so far from taking notice of her various arts to engage his attention, scarcely deigns to look at her, and even returns a letter unopened that he had received from her, to her maid *Rosetta*; and the act concludes.

In the second act, *Rosetta* acquaints her mistress with the ill success of her negotiation; which *Julia*, tho' inwardly piqued at, finds a means to construe to her own advantage; she then goes out to preside at an assembly, which, she is told by her aunt, waits her presence.

Clitander next succeeds, whom *Orphisa* encourages to pursue his designs upon the coquet, which she tells him will cer-

tainly turn out to his wish, as *Julia* was undoubtedly jealous of him, jealousy being a strong mark of love. *Clitander*, however, determines to pursue his own systems, and not openly to address *Julia* until he is convinced of her change of temper.

Rosetta, in the next scene, gives a pleasant account of the dispositions *Julia* has made for her parties at cards, and thereby shews that a coquet is nothing but a compound of artifices, and omits nothing that may contribute to her triumph.

The count now appears with *Rosetta* in the saloon, where the company is met. *Orphisa*, seeing him and the maid in conference, withdraws.

Julia comes on, and informs *Clitander* she has some tender thoughts for the count, one of his rivals; *Clitander* affects not to understand her, and feigning much indifference, goes so far as to tell her he pities her. This address hurts her vanity, and she obliges him to explain his sentiments upon the true nature of what alone deserves to be called love. Their conversation is interrupted by the count, who is enraged at her playing him such a scurvy trick as giving him only her hand to hold, whereas she went out to entertain his rival. The marquis, who follows his uncle, thinks the trick an excellent one, and gives him to understand that his reign is over. The count treats *Julia* and his nephew very peevishly, and goes out saying, that the loss of a coquet is not very much to be regretted. The marquis rallies *Julia* and *Clitander*, asserting that he has promised him to a president's lady, to whom he insists on presenting him; but *Julia* obliges him to go with her into the room where the company is.

In the third act, *Clitander* tells *Orphisa* that his hopes of reforming *Julia* decrease every day. That she had thrown out every lure to entrap him, that she could devise. He feels the more the danger to which he exposes himself, and is very sorry that all these advances are no more than coquetry at bottom. *Orphisa* assures him they are really pure love, that *Julia* is already become more serious, and that her jealousy redoubles. She then withdraws to leave *Clitander* and *Julia* together, having first recommended to the latter, the loving *Clitander* for her own sake. *Julia* wants in vain to get out of *Clitander* her aunt's

secret, which she fancies she has obtained, in supposing that they had concerted a private marriage, for which she blames her aunt, and *Clitander* justifies her on the account of her charms, which he describes as not yet past their meridian ; he also observes, that a husband is better pleased with virtue and good sense in a wife, than with personal perfections.

The marquiss entering, reproaches *Julia* with giving audience to *Clitander*, who is of a temper very unfit for her, and who had better first take some lessons from the baroness, she being a charming woman ; or else he may begin his course with the president's lady, who is full as fit to fashion and qualify him for *Julia's* service. *Clitander* seems to relish his advice, leaves *Julia* with the marquiss, who wants to engage her to a party at supper, where *Chloe* the president's lady and other women are to be on a scheme of playing a cruel trick to one of their society, and to set a husband and wife together by the ears ; *Julia* refuses to go without her aunt, at which resolution the marquiss is highly scandalized ; he threatens *Julia* to desert her acquaintance if she does not shake off that decency she still affects, which hurts that glory and reputation he has been endeavouring to give her in the world, and which she has not hitherto done any thing material to deserve.

She tells him, she is afraid of committing an irregularity ; the marquiss answers, that nothing is so noble as irregularity ; and lays down very pernicious maxims for manners. At length he takes leave of her, and assures her, that if she does not become more tractable, he will be the first to depreciate and ridicule her. *Julia*, who has already begun to open her eyes, finding the marquiss too dangerous, and his amusements too hurtful, retires, with design to deliver herself up to serious reflections.

ACT. IV. The effect of these reflections is being more and more engrossed with the idea of *Clitander* ; she talks of nothing else to *Rosetta*. *Orphisa* comes in to tell her they must soon separate, and that indispensable reasons oblige her to take another house. *Julia* expresses her concern, and wants to know the cause of this change. Her aunt confesses she is going to be married, and that this change of her condition will not allow of her living with her ; but declines telling her the name

of the husband she has chosen. *Julia*, unable to conceal her jealousy, does not doubt but it is *Clitander*; wherefore she is extremely agitated and out of humour. She orders herself to be denied to every body; and, to punish *Clitander*, resolves on becoming more perfect and estimable. *Clitander* only is admitted to see her. He acquaints *Julia* with the good office he has done her by hindering *Eraustus* from diverting the public with her letters to him, which he delivers to her. This proves to *Julia* the goodness of *Clitander*'s heart, and makes her feel the danger to which her levity had exposed her reputation, in listening to the addresses of so giddy a youth.

The president's lady, who next enters with the marquis, what with the indecency of her talk, and the irregularity of her conduct, compleats *Julia*'s reformation, who begins now to be afraid that others have the same contempt for her, as what the president's lady had inspired herself with; she goes out full of shame as well as remorse, and quite in love with *Clitander*.

ACT. V. *Rosetta* acquaints *Orphisa* with her mistress's change; who had passed the night without sleeping, and burned all her love-letters and lampoons. *Julia* comes in herself, and confirms to her aunt this alteration of her sentiments; *Orphisa* tells her, that these are only transient fits of the spleen, and that to restore her gaiety she has contrived a supper for the evening, where all the pretty fellows, and fine ladies of their acquaintance, will appear.

Julia tells her, that she has renounced, for ever, such worthless company; that she is resolved on a new plan of conduct; desiring that the past might be forgot, which she could not help. She declares, that, from henceforward she will only live for a man of merit that she loves.

Orphisa reproaches her for not having sooner trusted her with her design of marrying. *Julia*, very much embarrassed, avers to her aunt, that her happiness depends upon her alone, and that *Clitander* is the person who has made the conquest of her heart. *Orphisa* feigns some perplexity, and consents at length that *Clitander* should decide between them. Upon this the aunt goes to meet *Clitander* as he is entering, and tells him that *Julia* has something very important

tant to communicate to him; after which she leaves them together.

Julia asks *Clitander*, if it is true that he really loves *Orphisa*? He answers, that nothing is more certain, that he admires in her all those virtues so capable of pleasing 'so that, *replies Julia*, had I been possess of those same virtues, 'I might have flattered myself with engaging you.' —— 'You need not, *says Clitander*, doubt of it; since there is 'nothing wanting but such sentiments and solidity to make 'you perfectly adorable.' At this she cannot suppress her vexation and despair; and says things so affecting, that *Clitander* cries out, Why this is sentiment! this is the disposition in which I wished to see you. He then throws himself at her feet, and protests the sincerest love. *Orphisa* now appears again, embraces *Julia* with joy; owns to her, that all that had passed had been concerted with *Clitander* to bring her back into the road of esteem, and to unite her to a man that would make her happy.

Julia is charmed with this turn, and *Rosetta*, who comes in to acquaint her that the marquiss, the president's lady, and a great band of company, were waiting for her, perceives her satisfaction. *Julia* goes to receive them, for the last time, and to break off all connexions with a set of acquaintance which she now despises.

ART. XI. *A Voyage to Ægypt and Nubia, by Mr. Frederic Louis Norden, late Captain in the Danish navy.*

THIS work, which has been translated from the *Danish* to the *French* language, is published by the royal society of sciences at *Copenhagen*, in two large volumes in folio, illustrated with a great variety of copper plates. The author produces some very plausible reasons for supposing that *Alexandria* was built from the ruins of *Memphis*, and the stones conveyed through the calisch, or canal of *Cleopatra*. He gives some very necessary cautions, and instructions for those who may have occasion to travel among such brutal people; exhorting them, in particular, to beware of expressing too much curiosity, of striking a *Musselman*, or of engaging in an amour with a lady of the country.

He describes the cutting of the canal of *Calisch*, at the overflowing of the *Nile*, as a very paultry ceremony. He gives an account of the money, weights, measures, and commerce of *Cairo*, as well as of the well and granaries of *Joseph*, and the famous *Mokkins*, where they measure the increase of the *Nile* upon a pillar.

Then we find a short, concise description of the *Arabs*, who inhabit lower *Ægypt*, those that are settled in villages, and those that wander about; those that pay tribute to the *Turks*, and those that are independent.

In the fourth part he treats of the pyramids of *Memphis*, and observes, that in all probability they were more antient than the use of hieroglyphics, as no figures of that kind appear on any part of them. This division is concluded with remarks upon the pyramidography of *Greaves*, communicated to Mr. *Folkes*, late president of the Royal Society; and the volume concludes with some observations on the obelisks.

The second volume begins with a circumstantial journal of the author's voyage on the river *Nile* from *Cairo* to *Derrie* in upper *Ægypt*, traced upon a chart of the river made from observations. In his passage he describes more accurately the pyramids of *Sakarra*, which he supposes are more antient than those of *Memphis*; and ascertains the superb ruins of antient *Thebes* at *Carnae* and *Luxxor*, comprehending temples, colonades, obelisks, colossal statues, and the palace of *Memnon*—He passed the first cataract of the *Nile*, and visited the island *Giesfret ell Heist*, or *φιλν* of the antients, where he found the magnificent remains of the temple of *Isis*, which no modern traveller, before Mr. *Norden*, has had an opportunity to describe.

The journal is entertaining, and writ with candour and perspicuity; the paper is excellent, and the work elegantly printed; but the most valuable part of the performance consists in the plates, of which there are above a hundred and fifty in the two volumes, exhibiting every thing curious and remarkable, that occurred to the author in the course of his voyage, from beautiful drawings made with his own hand on the spot, engraved by his particular friend the celebrated *Marc Tuschet* of *Nuremberg*, who has likewise adorned the book

book with a print of the author, and some curious head and tail pieces.

There are some few errors of the press, as well as uncouth idioms in the language, which have escaped the corrector and translator; but on the whole we recommend it as a work of equal taste and labour, and the best description now extant of the course of the *Nile*, and the monuments of antiquity in upper *Ægypt*.

Monthly CATALOGUE.

Art. 12. *A Pathetic Address to all True Britons*, Pr. 6d. Scot,

The author of this piece may have a very good heart, but, in turning poet, he has given us but a bad instance of head; a sentence which our readers will be apt to confirm after perusing the following lines:

- ‘ Let past mistakes now warn you to be wise!
- ‘ Call forth your sons, O let them all arise!
- ‘ ’Tis not for riches, empire, or renown,
- ‘ But to defend what-ever is your own:
- ‘ Your life, your liberty, your *all*’s at stake,
- ‘ Fight for your wives, and for your children’s sake!
- ‘ Scorn to be press’d, ye able seamen fly,
- ‘ And for admittance in our ships apply;
- ‘ With generous ardour let your bosoms burn,
- ‘ And grateful praise your country shall return;
- ‘ With ample pay your labours shall reward,
- ‘ And treat each sailor with his due regard.’

ART. 13. *German Cruelty*.

This is no other than an extract from the *British History*, giving an account of the weakness and vicious disposition of king *Vortigern*, who called in the *Saxons* to assist the *Britons* in repelling their enemies; of the ingratitude and villainy of those mercenaries, who expelled the people they came to protect; and of an enterprising pretender, called *Aurelius Ambrosius*, to whose personal valour the *Britons* had recourse in their distress.

Whatever view the author may have had in writing this pamphlet, the events of that period are such as deserve the serious attention of every *Englishman*, who wishes well to his country.

A Reply to a Letter in the GENERAL EVENING POST,
subscribed J. Parsons.

A Letter addressed to the author of the CRITICAL REVIEW, and subscribed J. Parsons, having made its appearance in the *General Evening Post* of Tuesday September 21, it may not be improper to say something, by way of reply, to that

that extraordinary epistle, which puts us in mind of those ancient theatrical masques which laughed on one side of the face, and cried on the other—Perhaps we might have let it sleep in oblivion, had not we thought that the reputation of the learned *Dr. Parsons* was more affected by it, than that of any other person. We are assuredly grieved to see some ill-natured wag has subscribed that venerable name to such a heap of galimatias: verily he might as well have stolen the Doctor's perriwig, and placed the fool in that disguise, in order to bring the real owner's understanding into discredit. In the first place, this irreverent joker says, the authors of the *CRITICAL REVIEW* ought to have published the whole article, by *Dr. Parsons*, relating to the lycoperdon, that the world might be made acquainted with every experiment relating to it. Now we cannot imagine the modest *Dr. Parsons* himself could expect that we should give his article the preference to all others: far less can we suppose that he would have us transcribe the whole volume of the *Philosophical Transactions*, in a shilling pamphlet. Such a thing might, perhaps, be effected with the assistance of the curious *Mr. Aulay Macaulay*, teacher and inventor of short-hand; but, that expedient would neither answer the Doctor's purpose, nor ours, and might conceal a vast fund of useful knowledge from the ordinary reader.

The next strange doctrine which this disguised enemy of *Dr. Parsons* advances, is, that a man, who writes of matters of importance, ought not to trouble his head about diction: that is to say, if your intention is to communicate knowledge, no matter whether you be, or be not, understood: for, we apprehend, that diction is the vehicle in which an author's meaning is conveyed; and if no regard is to be paid to this vehicle, it may be conveyed in *Arabic* as well as in *English*. This assertion is like that of an honest gentleman, who affirmed he had seen an *Irish* manuscript that contained a thousand curious particulars, a good number of which he recounted, adding it was written in characters which no man alive understood. As this cannot be the case, with the writings of *Dr. Parsons*, so neither can we believe he would make such a wild declaration, as, that diction is not to be minded by a philosopher. With respect to the lycoperdon, we never doubted its vegetation, though we called it an excrescence—we need not look into *Linneus* for a description of the common puff-bulls, which are produced under the shade of every old tree; neither could our words imply that we supposed it was a substance pulverized for the purpose. If the powder of this puff had not affected the eye-sight of the letter writer, he would have seen the contrary: unless this remark, like the other parts of the letter, was calculated for depreciating the intellects of the learned *Dr. Parsons*.

sons. That eminent philosopher would have known the lycoperdon is oftener termed an excrescence than a plant: nor would he have called the powder, a collection of seeds, upon hearsay. What would the world say of a professed naturalist, if he was found so ignorant of the constituent parts of a common puff-ball? would not they say that all human wisdom was vanity, and that to philosophize, was no better than *ωισδω*, anglicè to puff.

But in nothing has this fictitious counterfeit abused the honourable name he assumes, more than in his criticism upon the words *nothing more* and *nothing less*. "If" (says he) "I had said that agates were nothing more than crystals debased, it would have been a rank solecism." Suppose a vapourish lady, seeing Dr. *Parsons* approach, should cry, "O Lord! who sent for that undertaker?" and the nurse should reply, "Undertaker! madam, I see *nothing more than* the Doctor;" would any person tax the nurse with having been guilty of a solecism? and yet every man must allow that Dr. *Parsons* is superior to any undertaker in her class. No, that learned gentleman would never have persisted in such an error. He would have found upon recollection, that *nothing more than*, is an idiom copied from the Latin, *nihil amplius quam*, signifying *nothing but*, or *nothing else*; for example, *nihil amplius quam continere se statuit*. On the other hand, he would have owned, after due deliberation, that nothing could be more improper than this phrase, "Flints and agates are *nothing less than* crystals debased by earth;" unless his meaning was that they were as little the substance of crystals debased by earth, as any other substance whatsoever—if any person should say that Dr. *Parsons* was *nothing less than* a philosopher, would not the hearer naturally conclude he was no philosopher? Indeed, if the phrase was carried to *no less than* a philosopher, it would bear a contrary interpretation; because *no* is used for the simple negative particle *not*, as *not less*; whereas *nothing*, in this phrase, implies a sort of comparison, as *no-thing less*; or *no creature less*; it has the same acceptance in Latin, *nihil minus quam philosophus*; in Greek, as, *οὐδὲν ἥττω*, in Italian, as *niente meno*, in Spanish, as *nada menos*, and in French, as. *Rien moins, rien moins que philosophe; rien moins que politique*; any thing but a philosopher, a most wretched politician. I do not doubt but the same idiom prevails in the *Irish* tongue; though the phraseology of that language is said in many instances to be quite different from the peculiarities of the other *European* tongues; but, for this, as well as the rest of our doubts, we will appeal to the Doctor's own extensive knowledge.

The last reason we shall produce for believing Dr. *Parsons* could not be the author of the letter in the *General Evening Post*,

is the arrogance with which that writer assumes the appellation of a *great naturalist*. He says the author of the *CRITICAL REVIEW*, in conferring upon him the title of *the great natural*, robbed him of a syllable which would have made it *naturalist*; in other words, perverted his true title, which was that of *the great naturalist*. Now will any man say, that Dr. *Parsons* would leave modesty so far on the left hand, as to demand such a title. No. If he had even investigated all the shells that were gathered by the army of *Caligula*, we will venture to say, he would not have so publicly claimed such a superb epithet, as would raise him above an *Alexander*, or a *Pompey*, as far as philosophy soars above the art of war. Nor would Dr. *Parsons* have given such strange reasons for proving, that the theft of a syllable was a petty larceny between friends. "You have (says he) stole a syllable from me, which, between friends, is a petty-larceny, and very indecent, as well as unjust; because you have lost all claim to it yourself, and can have no manner of business with it: but, as it stands, it is your own without doubt, and it would be shameful to take it from you." We have stole, it seems, the syllable *ist*, which syllable *ist*, is between friends a petty-larceny—is it indeed? then the syllable must stand indited of the petty-larceny: it is not only a petty-larceny, but likewise indecent and unjust. Why is the syllable *ist* indecent and unjust? because we have lost all claim to it ourselves, and can have no manner of business with it. If it be indecent and unjust, heaven forbid that we should have any business with it! But, how we came to have a particular claim in the syllable *ist*, and then to lose that claim; and in what manner it became a petty-larceny by our losing it, are mysteries of iniquity which we wish this disguised writer would unravel.

Dr. *Parsons* would not have allowed himself to be surprised in such an inconsistency, as that of saying in one paragraph, that the *CRITICAL REVIEWERS* were condemned in every company for their passionate way of writing, and afterwards affirming, that should they put a stop to that way of writing, their finances might be affected. He would have had more urbanity than to reflect upon the finances of those whom he does not know; and better bred than to apply the terms hunting and unkennelling to any persons who maintain the characters of gentlemen. However this obscure writer may have trespassed against the laws of common decency in this respect, every person concerned in the *CRITICAL REVIEW* has humanity enough to call at his garret and relieve him in his Distress, should he want their assistance; or if he chuses to come a hunting to their kennel, he will find a horse-whip ready prepared.

pared. Before he claims their good offices, however, he must first manifest signs of real penitence for the injury he has done the learned Dr. *Parsons*, with whom we are ready to concur in punishing this impostor, or in prosecuting the publishers of the paper, in which the letter was inserted. If such attempts pass with impunity, no man's character is safe. It is from a tenderness to Dr. *Parsons* that we have taken such pains to detect this conspiracy; on our own account we should have taken no notice of such a frivolous antagonist.

THE authors of the CRITICAL REVIEW having been informed, by letters and otherwise, that some gentlemen of taste and learning are disposed to communicate their observations occasionally, on new performances, could they be certain that the same articles are not already discussed by the Proprietors and Undertakers of the REVIEW; all those who may be inclined to correspond with the Society in this manner, are desired to signify, by letter to the publisher, the particular books they intend to consider.

THE authors of the CRITICAL REVIEW take this opportunity of thanking the gentleman, who was kind enough in a letter dated *August 17*, to point out some inaccuracies which had crept into the Number for *July*. They had corrected the error relating to *Bower's* letters before they received *A. M's* intimation, and as the last number was already complete, they could not 'till now, conveniently acknowledge their obligation to their unknown correspondent.

They likewise own themselves indebted to the candour of *D. Q.* for his remarks on the account which is given in their last number, of the *fourth letter to the people of England*. They confess the words relating to *L—d L—n* may bear another interpretation than that which they have put upon them; but, considering the peculiar virulence of the author, his ridiculous enmity to the natives of *North Britain*, and the palpable design of the work, which was to kindle the animosity of the nation against all those who are employed under the *G—t*, the CRITICAL REVIEWERS thought they had a right to understand it, as a malicious sarcasm against that nobleman.

ERRATUM in the last number.

Page 25. *for* great natural, (speaking of Dr. *Parsons*) read great naturalist.